HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME VIII OCTOBER, 1915 NUMBER 4

THE POSITION AND PROSPECTS OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

ALFRED FAWKES

ASHBY ST. LEDGERS, ENGLAND

In the *Cambridge Modern History*[1] and in a later work, *Studies in Modernism*,[2] the present writer has given an account of the last three pontificates, those of Pius IX, Leo XIII, and Pius X. Each of the three was in its own way a momentous pontificate, and has left a lasting mark on the Church. With the present Pope a new period opens. It will be one of harvest. The passions unloosed by his immediate predecessors have burned themselves out; but their works follow them. Benedict XV will reap what they have sown. Also—and this is the real key to the position—he will have to meet the situation created by the European war. His is a pathetic, almost a tragic, figure; for it combines the appearance of power with the fact of powerlessness. Never was man less master of his fate than he. His infallibility binds him hand and foot; he inherits the legacy of evil left by his predecessors; he is crushed under the crimes of kings.

To the student of mankind few subjects offer greater interest than the position and prospects of the Roman

[1] Vol. XI, Chap. XXV. [2] Smith, Elder, & Co., 1913.

Catholic Church. The issues raised are complex and, it may appear, uncertain. It is difficult to reconcile theory and fact; for while the Church professes to be unchanging, the outlook of Catholics changes, though slowly. And a "dry light" is not easy of attainment. The tone of Papal Encyclicals, e.g., is uniformly pessimistic; that of the clerical press as uniformly optimistic; visionaries, such as Mr. H. G. Wells and the late Mgr. Benson, prophesy good; scientific and statistical writers evil. Which are we to believe?

In any case it is well to note certain notorious facts bearing upon the question.

(1) While Pre-Reformation Catholicism, at least in the West, was the Church, Post-Reformation Catholicism is one of the Churches—of the fragments into which mediaeval Christendom broke up at the Reformation; and this distinction is one whose importance it is impossible to over-rate. Mediaeval Catholicism represented its period—the Middle Ages; Modern Catholicism does not represent, indeed it is a standing protest against, the modern age.

(2) There is now no such thing as a Catholic country —a nation whose life, laws, and civilization are formed on Catholic lines. Nor can we conceive such a society as possible. Catholicism has become an individual attitude, and ceased to be a corporate fact.

(3) Catholicism is no longer world-wide, or even European, but Latin. The dividing line drawn in the sixteenth century left the non-Romance nations on the Protestant, the Romance or Latin—with the Irish Celts—on the Catholic side.

(4) Even in these nations Catholicism declines as civilization advances. The backward section of the community remains Catholic; the forward section sits loose to or falls away from the Church. "Of the Vatican's 190,000,000 followers more than 120,000,000 are illit-

erate. This means that the majority of the Roman Catholics of the world to-day consists of American Indians, half-castes, negroes, and mulattoes; Italian, Spanish, Russian, and Slavonic peasants of the most backward character; and Indian, Indo-Chinese, and African natives. These make up much more than half of the whole. Further, the great bulk of the remainder are the peasants and poor workers of Germany, Austria, France, Belgium, and Ireland. This aspect of Catholicism is perhaps the most important of all."[3]

On the other hand,

(5) Catholicism bulks larger before the world than it did a century ago; and

(6) the Catholic population is larger. While

(7) there is a perceptible movement, known in France as the *esprit nouveau*, which appears to be making in the direction of the Catholic Church.

To which it may be answered that the part is not to be taken for the whole; that population as such has risen by leaps and bounds during the nineteenth century; and that this, taken with the fact of migration, accounts both for the increased number of Catholics and for their political influence—which is most noticeable in mixed countries where a small group of voters can often turn an election. While the so-called *esprit nouveau* is temperamental rather than either intellectual or religious in character, its ecclesiastical form is accidental; the substance is a certain timidity and refusal of adventure. "Vos protestations d'activité masquent un affaiblissement de la pensée française qui a besoin de repos."[4]

In Pius IX (1846–78) the recoil from the French Revolution reached its height. After an episode of sentimental democracy (1846–48), he fell back upon

[3] The Decay of the Church of Rome. Joseph McCabe. P. 305.

[4] Jean Barois. Roger Martin du Gard. P. 444.

absolutism in politics and a centralized theocracy in religion. The achievement of his pontificate was the suppression of the remains of eighteenth century Liberalism which, in the shape of Gallicanism, Febronianism, and Pistoianism, still lingered in the Church. For details the reader will do well to consult Friedrich's *Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils* (Bonn, 1877). Never has Catholicism sunk so low as in his reign. The Pope was a visionary, and the epileptic tendency from which he suffered was the key to his personality. He was led by omens and prophecies; the atmosphere in which he lived was one of marvel; it was the age of La Salette, Lourdes, and Paray-le-monial. Antonelli threw a miracle or a dogma from time to time to the pietists, as one throws a bone to a dog, to quiet them, while he intrigued with the worst men in Europe for the Temporal Powers and the petty Italian tyrannies. He failed, leaving a legacy of hatred, unexhausted to this day, behind him, and the breakdown of his policy led inevitably to a new departure under the new pontiff. "Ecce, convertimur ad Gentes!" was the watchword of Leo XIII.

Leo was no less impregnated with the lust of domination than his predecessor, and, diplomatist as he was, he was even more imperious; but he was what Pius had not been—a wise, a wary, and a strong man. From the first this was felt. Caricaturists had represented Pius IX as a querulous scolding old woman. No one—and the fact is significant—ever represented Leo XIII in this way. He might be disapproved of, disliked, or distrusted; he could not be despised. For a man of his years and calling he possessed in a singular degree the instinct for fact. His most memorable act was his breach with Legitimism. The party, he saw, was effete and its alliance compromising. "There," he said, pointing to the crucifix, "there is the only corpse to

which the Church is tied." He was of the old order, and democracy was temperamentally uncongenial to him; but in his Encyclicals on the Labor question, as in the encouragement given to the *Sillon* in France and the *Democrazia cristiana* in Italy, he recognized it as a fact of the situation. The critical movement lay beyond his personal horizon, but he would not condemn Modernism. He can scarcely have loved the French Republic; but only a few days before his death he assured the French Ambassador that "nothing" (he repeated it emphatically), "nothing should make him break with France." He believed that he could catholicize democracy and science. He could not; the one and the other alike escaped and outstripped him. This was the tragedy of his reign.

But if he could not do all, he did much. He could not change the course of events or direct their development on other than their own lines. But he made the best where others before and after him made the worst of the situation; he arrested the forces that made for dissolution; he encouraged the higher and repressed the lower elements in the vast and complex society with which he had to deal. He left the Church respected. Under his predecessor it had been, under his successor it was to become, contemptible. While Leo lived, it was a power to be reckoned with; not only politically—this it must be for long, under whatever rulers—but in thought and life. It attracted some of the weightiest static elements of the body politic, men—of whom M. Brunetière was a type—who put unity and action before speculation, and saw in the Church the great centripetal force in society, the centre of gravity with whose removal or weakening the various elements would inevitably lose cohesion and disperse. The instability of French politics has made this point of view more familiar to French than to English thinkers. It may, or

may not, imply religious belief; there is a party known as *les catholiques athées*. But it certainly implies the support of religious institutions; and, as in France these are Catholic, a wise Pope will court the alliance of those who hold this position. Leo XIII did so. But—*do ut des*. There are conditions, if tacit conditions, to their cooperation. Can any stretch of the imagination picture the late editor of the *Revue des Deux Mondes* presenting himself at the Vatican under Pius X?

But it was not political thinkers only who ceased to despair of Catholicism. It was thought possible to graft the methods and conclusions of science upon its venerable traditions, and so to make the centuries one. These aspirations took shape in Modernism—an attempt to naturalize history, criticism, and the philosophy of spirit, in the Church. It was a dream. But it was a dream dreamed by the wisest and best men in Latin Christendom—a dream which it was, and is, well to have dreamed. "Il est beau non de rêver toujours, mais d'avoir rêvé dans son enfance. Il en reste un parfum et comme une tradition de poésie qui defraie l'âge ou l'on n'imagine plus." Its Achilles' heel was that it overlooked what is the distinctive feature of Latin, or Roman, Catholicism—the peculiar development of the notion of authority embodied in the Papacy, and the consequent relation of the Church to the modern mind-movement, which is that of a residuum left behind when the freer and saner elements of life have broken away. Were Catholicism to lose this character, it would cease to attract the social and cultural levels to which it is now so uniquely adapted. Those who occupy them do not think, and do not want to think. "Abide ye here with the ass, while I and the lad go yonder and worship"; they are children of the bondwoman, not of the free. Leo XIII saw this as clearly as his successor; but he saw also what his successor did not see—that a

Church incapable of movement will be left behind by a moving world, and that Modernism was a development of the human spirit which, if the Papacy could not admit, it could still less suppress. Seeing the inevitableness of the rising tide, he refused the unequal conflict; he temporized, and would neither sanction nor condemn. He trusted to events—to the weight of custom, and to the preponderance of the fixed over the volatile elements in ecclesiastical Christianity—to retain the equilibrium of the conflicting forces; which was probably the wisest thing that a Pope could do.

His policy, he hoped, would survive him; he did all that a Pope can do to secure the reversion of the Papacy to the one man of eminence in the Sacred College, Cardinal Rampolla. The Austrian Veto shattered the scheme; and the cardinals, who under his autocratic rule were rather subordinates than counsellors, scattered like frightened sheep. The *piccolo mondo cinquecentesco* which he had kept at arm's length saw its opportunity. A cave of Adullam, in which "everyone that was in distress, and everyone that was in debt, and everyone that was discontented" gathered, was formed. They were ignorant and hated knowledge; they were intolerant and hated compromise; they were stupid and the signs of the times were hidden from them. The outcome—he was rather their instrument and dupe than their conscious ally—was Pius X (1903–14). A peasant by birth, a country priest by training, he possessed at once the virtues and the defects of his class—its simplicity and its narrowness, its piety and its guile. Imposed by the Triple Alliance on the Conclave, he was the Pope of a reaction, which, like most reactions, carried those concerned in it very much further than they wished or intended. For the temper of Rome is the reverse of fanatical. It is that of the permanent staff of a great public department. The men who compose the Curia

are of the official type—cautious, painstaking, unimaginative. They distrusted Modernism, being opposed to ideas and to innovation as such, but they would have met it with other weapons than the Encyclical *Pascendi;* they resented the policy of the French Republic, but they would not have lost France. Their disapproval of the Pope and his Spanish advisers was undisguised. Conceive the late General Booth Archbishop of Canterbury! The cases are parallel. Can it be wondered that to the day of his death Pius X was a stranger in Rome? He was unhappy in his choice of agents, and of much that was done under, if not by, him the less said the better. Nowhere did the malaria which hangs about the base of the Rock of Peter work more poisonously than in the Concordat controversy. The unfortunate French bishops were compelled to carry out a policy—that with regard to the *Associations Cultuelles*—against which they had protested, and to keep silence when the fact of their protest was denied, while the Montagnini papers—the *Fiches Pontificales*—give an unpleasing picture of the Vatican interior. The *camarilla* which surrounded the Pope was frankly detestable; both he and his office were degraded by contact with these bad men.

The Pontifical Acts of 1907 struck at more than Modernism. Much was condemned that had a historical position in Catholicism—mysticism, experimental faith, immanence, symbolism—all that spiritualizes system and inspires formula with life. What was left was bare, dead letter. "The Church and the Faith which the Church holds were made ridiculous," says an article remarkable in itself, and doubly remarkable because of the quarter in which it appears. "But for those who desired to remain in communion with the Church, the farce became tragic; the most odious, because the least bloody, methods of the Inquisition were revived."

The leprosy of delation, never far from the surface where ecclesiastics congregate, broke out. It was the hour of the spy and the informer; the sun of Apostolic favor fell upon the assassins of the whisper and the pen. "No piety, no simplicity can cover up the conduct of the *Corrispondenza Romana*. It was base, and crudely base."[5] What wonder that Father Tyrrell broke out with vehement words of indignation? "I have felt the moral badness of Rome and the Curia so deeply and acutely these last years that I cannot take service as a priest under such *canaille*. The Montagnini and Benigni revelations have extinguished every spark of respect for the present *personnel* of the Roman See. There must be a *debâcle*. After that, perhaps, a reconstruction. The root error was in 1870. Condense all power into the hands of one man, who may be a fool or a knave, and what can you expect? It would be a miracle if things were otherwise, and miracles don't happen."[6]

That a policy must be judged by its results is a view to which the moralist will not easily assent. The ethical element is in the long run decisive; men are moved, and will continue to be moved, by ideas. But let us take the force-standard for what it is worth here and now, prescinding from its ultimate value, and ask in what state have the eleven years of the late Pontificate left the Church?

(1) In 1903 Catholic scholarship ran close on the heels of Protestant. No Protestant had done better work in criticism than Loisy; as a thinker Tyrrell stood with Troeltsch and Eucken; no German or English historian ranked higher than Duchesne. Science, it was recognized, was undenominational; it knew neither Jew nor Greek. Now the Catholic Ghetto has been reconstructed. "Acatholica damnantur; catholica non

[5] The Church Times. Aug. 21, 1914.

[6] Autobiography and Life of George Tyrrell, II, 340.

leguntur." Catholic writers are un-read, non-Catholic banned.

(2) In 1903 a generous ardor inspired the youth of the Latin nations. Simplicity, sincerity, the realization of the better self of individuals and communities—such were the ideals of the coming generation; materialism, sensuality, self-seeking had crossed the Rhine. Now an arid sirocco has breathed over this spring; the blow struck at the *Sillon* chilled and crushed its bloom. So with the Italian *Opera dei Congressi* and the German *Christlicher Arbeiter Verein.* The former was lay, the latter unsectarian. They were openly suppressed or tacitly discouraged; the gates of the Ghetto shut with a clang. The Index, as far as in it lay, silenced Catholic and non-Catholic writers indiscriminately—the thought of Maeterlinck and the speculation of Bergson, the piety of Fogazzaro and the erudition of Duchesne. It was a dull stupid tyranny, and it was as blind as it was stupid. Excellence was a sufficient reason for proscription; to be distinguished was to be condemned.

(3) In 1903 France was the eldest daughter of the Church. There had been friction, but it was less real than apparent. No love was lost between the secular clergy and the regulars. The bishops protested against the suppression of the religious Orders, but their protests were half-hearted. The Government had done what they wished done but could not themselves do. Now—"La grande pitié des Églises de France"! The official Church is bleeding to death from the wound inflicted by the abolition of the Concordat, and its consequent moral and material separation from the national life.

What is there to put over against these things? An attempted revival of plain chant; certain changes in the service books; the modification of a few fasts, and the abolition of a few feasts, of obligation; the admission

of children of seven to communion; the general enforcement of the *Ne Temere* decree of the Council of Trent, invalidating "clandestine" marriages; certain technical changes in the procedure of the Roman Congregations. With this, all has been said.

> Atque utinam his potius nugis tota illa dedisset
> Tempora saevitiae, claras quibus abstulit Urbi
> Illustresque animas impune et vindice nullo.

Otherwise did the great founders of the Papacy envisage the world and life. So do shades mutter; not so do the voices of the living sound.

Benedict XV represents the inevitable reaction against reaction. He is a Curialist first and foremost. In him the tradition which takes the Pope from the highly trained officials who form the staff of the great Roman Congregations resumes its sway. He will not be influenced, it is safe to say, by ideas; he will say little; he will have little sympathy either with the dull obscurantism of his predecessor or with Leo's launch into the deep. His policy will be one of reserve; he will be prudent. But should the times call for other than the prudential virtues—for initiative, adventure, spaciousness of outlook—he may fail.

"Sarà, dunque, un pontificato di raccoglimento. Più che un pontefice, un capo, Benedetto XV ha l' aria di essere un commissario. Ma a vita e senza superiori. E un terzo aspetto, e interessantissimo, della crisi dell' autocrazia nella chiesa: l' infallibilita taciturna."[7]

He starts with one great advantage; he succeeds Pius X. No change, it is generally felt—and nowhere more than at Rome—could be for the worse; any change must be for the better. There is a disposition to make allowance for the immense difficulties of the situation which he inherits, to interpret his actions in the most

[7] Bilychnis. Oct. 1914.

favorable sense. And the war facilitates a new departure. Both the Modernist controversy and the breach with the French Republic are now ancient history; more actual interests absorb men's minds. Other lines of movement, ethical and moral rather than theological, are indicated. They have not, so far, been followed. The world is moving, surely and rapidly; the bark of Peter hugs the shore. It was a saint

"Che fece per viltate il gran rifiuto";

but it may be made by an over-cautious politician as well as by a timid saint. The personal impression given by Benedict XV is favorable; no Pope since Pius VII has inspired so much esteem. "Le nouveau pape est personellement très estimable," says a well-informed writer; "prêtre digne et pieux, administrateur énergique, et cependant modéré de caractère. Il est politique, mais par tempérament, semble-t-il, autant et plus que par réflexion. Bien qu'il est intelligent, son esprit ne se pose pas sur les questions générales et de principe; ou bien, si une telle question se présente, il la décompose tout spontanément en un certain nombre de questions particulières, dirons pratiques, auxquelles il cherche une solution. Ce ne serait donc pas uniquement par prudence qu'il se serait abstenu de discuter la guerre présente du point de vue du droit, mais aussi bien qu'il n'y aurait pas pensé, ou qu'il n'aurait pas vu l'utilité d'une telle discussion. Il ne verrait que la situation donnée, l'état de guerre; et il s'efforcerait simplement d'en atténuer les horreurs selon ses moyens, qui, en effet, ne sont pas grands." In other words, he is wanting in imagination, his horizons are narrow, he has little power of dealing with ideas. At certain times and under certain conditions men with these defects have done excellent work in the world. But in the European situation of today they are precisely the defects which

are fatal to leadership. The large view, the quick insight, the adventurous temper—these are the "notes" of the leaders of modern men.

The good qualities of the Pope set the dissatisfaction inspired by the policy of the Papacy at the present crisis in a stronger light. The Roman Bishop is, *ex hypothesi*, the infallible teacher in faith and morals. With regard to the former, he extends his jurisdiction. Question some subtle point of scholastic divinity; at once you find yourself excluded from the sacraments and cut off from the Church. Morality is another thing. In the face of the unprecedented horrors of the present war, Rome is silent. Treaties are broken, territories devastated, non-combatants massacred, women shamed. "But there was no voice, nor any that answered." Not even the invasion of ecclesiastical privilege—the violation of churches, the killing of priests, the forcible detention of a cardinal—provokes a protest; the Infallible is dumb.

The answer—of which, to do them justice, those who make it seem somewhat ashamed—that the Pope, being the common Father, cannot take part against any of his children, is the merest trifling. The superior who keeps silence is answerable for the ill-doing of his subjects and becomes partaker of their sin. Not so did the great Mediaeval Pontiffs conceive their calling. Their dream of a theocracy, if impossible, was at least grandiose; when it was dissipated, an age of Epigoni set in. The Vicar of Christ became an Italian prince; and the possession of this petty principality was fatal to the larger conception of the Papacy; its memory haunts the modern Popes like an evil dream. It is here, not on the ground of technical theology, that the key to the situation of the Roman Church of today is found. For the politics of the Church explain her theology—not *vice versa;* a concrete wrong moves men more easily and profoundly

than an abstract error in belief. The Temporal Power did Catholicism more harm than the Vatican Definition of Papal Infallibility; the Laodicean attitude of Benedict XV in the face of the present unloosing of Satan discredits the Papacy more than did the anti-Modernist follies of Pius X. In France, which, even under the Republic, remains the centre of the Latin world, the signs of discontent are manifest. The reserve of the Pope with regard to the violation of Belgian neutrality, and the coldness (to use no stronger word) of his attitude towards Cardinal Mercier, have excited the surprise and indignation of the French press, which had expected to find in him a warmer champion of a Catholic country and a Christian cause. The Paris papers veil their censure, so as not to divide opinion by giving offence to the clericals; but the provincial journals are more outspoken. Special attention has been excited by an article entitled "Dieu n'est pas neutre,"[8] and remarkable both in itself and as coming from a well-known priest. The writer characterizes the Pope's protestations against war as "un peu conventionelles et comme 'de style.'" In a conflict of ideas and principles neutrality is impossible: "est-ce que Dieu est neutre?"

"Que votre Sainteté, face à face avec le Crucifié, daigne se demander ce qu'auraient fait, devant le monceau des crimes allemands, les grands Papes vos prédecesseurs —Léon, Grégoire, Boniface, Pie, etc.? Auraient-ils toléré, ces preux illustres et venerables de la théocratie, le massacre des femmes, des enfants, et des prêtres? l'incendie des villes ouvertes? la destruction des églises?

"Guillaume II a violé toutes les lois divines et humaines. Il a écrasé un petit peuple, loyal et fier. Il est couvert de sang et d'opprobre. Vous n'avez rien dit. Il a fait tuer centaines de vos prêtres; il détient prisonniers

[8] Le Petit Dauphinois. Grenoble. Jan. 11, 1915.

trois évêques; il vient d'outrager un cardinal de la Sainte Église Romaine. Vous n'avez encore rien dit. Pour moins que cela Pie VII a excommunié Napoléon. Pourquoi vous taisez-vous? Pourquoi demeurez-vous 'neutre' entre eux, abominables à jamais, et leurs victimes? Jésus-Christ ne serait pas neutre."

Such protests as these are untouched by Modernism; they spring from another soil. And their importance lies in implications of which those concerned are scarcely, if at all, conscious. What they show is that Catholicism is a spent force. Its weapons are blunted, and, such as they are, it dares not use them. The thunderbolts of the Church, which once terrified Kings, today excite no more than a modified fear in peasants. When the late Pope excommunicated a famous French scholar, his servant, influenced by his confessor, left him, but returned within the week. And the more conspicuous the culprit, the stronger the disinclination to proceed to extremities. The risk is too great. Even Pius IX did not venture to excommunicate Victor Emmanuel by name; it needed a Pius X to inflict this penalty on Loisy and Romolo Murri. And the world did not even laugh—it passed him and his sentence by. The present case, it is true, is not *in pari materia;* the crime of the Emperors shocks the conscience of mankind. But a Pope could not excommunicate the Catholic sovereigns of Germany and release the subjects of the Protestant from their allegiance without greatly daring; and the Catholicism of the twentieth century dares not greatly dare. It would be a break with the traditions of nearly four hundred years, a revival of claims long obsolete, and the adoption of a policy which, if a failure, would place the Papacy definitely on a shelf in a museum of antiquities; while, if successful, it would transform the Church into a living force whose action would defy calculation. Benedict XV is not the man to risk the venture. There is

no reason to suppose that he takes himself otherwise than seriously. But to believe that the world, even the Catholic world, rates the Papacy at its theological valuation, or that the venerable system for which it stands can endure the strain of a new birth or sustain the shock of a new departure—this presupposes mental and moral qualities of a very exceptional order. "I have not found such faith, no not in Israel." It is not within but without the Churches that it is found. The Churches are stationary, not expeditionary, forces, and their piety is of the static type.

The two main features of the late Pontificate were, as has been said, the crusade against Modernism and the abolition of the French Concordat of 1801. With regard to both a certain reaction has taken place. The Pontifical Acts of 1907 have still further alienated the lay mind from the clerical; they have driven from the Church not a few persons whose natural place is in her communion, and repelled men of good will who were gravitating towards faith. The value of these results it is for those concerned to estimate. What we shall note here is the fact of a reaction, even under Pius X, against the "fool-fury" of the "insolent and aggressive faction" which had the ear of the Pope. Today bishops denounce Integralism; the *Tribuna*[9] notes the changed attitude of Jesuits: "Se veramente la Compagnia di Gesù ha deliberato di fare del liberalismo . . . gesuitico, non v' e integralismo che tenga. Pio X passa; la Compagnia resta." Benedict XV has little sympathy with or understanding of Modernism as such. But it is probable that he will trespass as little as possible on the ground of speculative or scientific theology. It is impossible to isolate so large a body as the Roman Catholic Church, or to prevent the Liberalism which is tolerated from passing over into the Modernism which has been condemned. There will always be a van- and rear-guard.

[9] Sept. 25, 1913.

The work of Rome in the near future may be less to take part with either than to keep the peace between the two. A certain element of make-belief is inseparable from the process; it is also inseparable from human affairs.

It is difficult for a foreigner to understand the shape taken by the religious problem in France. The country is not irreligious or even uncatholic, but it is anti-clerical; and since Catholicism is essentially clerical and French religion essentially Catholic, friction arises. The policy of Pius X undoubtedly embarrassed the government. The Republic will not go to Canossa, but it did not intend, and does not contemplate with satisfaction, the dilapidation of the churches and the starving out of the clergy; it was the obstinacy of Rome, not the will of the French people, which brought about these things. A few months ago it might have been thought that the "union sacrée" inaugurated by the war indicated a probable solution of the difficulty. The conduct of the clergy, secular and regular, and of the religious orders of women, has been heroic; the tie of country has proved higher and more binding than that of sect. Might not this patriotic collaboration be extended to home politics? By an inconsiderable sacrifice of *amour propre* on the part of the Church and the government, might not at least a *modus vivendi* be attained?

It is probable that such an agreement could, and would, have been reached, had it not been for the "neutrality" of the Vatican with regard to the German invasion of Belgium and French Flanders, and the horrors by which this invasion has been accompanied. The feeling aroused by the "neutrality" of Rome has created an entirely new situation. It may be open to discussion whether the Pope is or is not infallible, or whether transubstantiation does or does not take place in the Eucharist; but it is not open to discussion whether murder and rape

and robbery are evil, or whether a religious teacher is bound by the obligation of his office to denounce them. "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I am against the shepherds; and I will require my flock at their hands." The present age is not one in which it is wise to put a strain upon faith. Even by those who retain them, the traditional beliefs are acquiesced in rather than held with conviction or fervor, and their external framework —churches, creeds, religious observance—is increasingly regarded as a matter of circumstances and expediency, conditioned by place and time. The conception of morality, on the other hand, has extended and developed; its content is greater, its foundations are stronger, its horizons are larger than in any previous age. Were the Pope to speak out boldly, "Thou shalt not," the conscience of the world would be with him as it has never been even with his greatest predecessors. He will not; and in consequence the conscience of the world is falling from him and from the conception of religion for which he stands. The root fallacy of this conception is that it substitutes the outward for the inward, identifies the idea with its clothing, and forgets that the Word of God is neither system nor enactment but spiritual life. Whether or no the famous letter which appeared in the *Petite Gironde* (of Dec. 24, 1914) is rightly or wrongly attributed to a Belgian prelate, it is certain that it has been largely circulated in France and Belgium, and that it expresses the all but universal feeling of Catholics in those unhappy countries:

"*Most Holy Father,*

We have heard the declaration by which you have announced that you will observe a strict neutrality between the two camps in this frightful war which devastates the world. Respectfully submissive to the supreme Pastor and Doctor, we shall henceforth exhibit a like attitude both to oppressors and oppressed. If we have not done so hitherto, it is because we have believed that we found mo-

tives in the Scriptures for treating differently the victim and his executioner.

When the first murder was committed, God said to Cain, 'The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me; thou shalt be cursed.' When God announced the destruction of Sodom, Abraham remonstrated: 'Wilt thou consume the righteous with the wicked? That be far from thee to do in this manner. Shall not the Judge of all the Earth do right?' St. Paul has said, 'Abhor that which is evil'; and in the Gospel we read, 'Ye cannot serve God and Mammon.'

For these reasons, Most Holy Father, we have pronounced anathema upon the barbarians. And for yet another—that our poor decimated flock should not apply to their shepherds the reproach of Malachi to the unworthy Levites: 'Therefore have I also made you base and contemptible before all the people, according as ye have not kept my ways, but have respect of persons in the law.'

But henceforth, faithful to the lessons let fall from the Chair of St. Peter, we shall observe the strictest neutrality between the martyrs and the torturers."

Bitter, but deserved, is the irony of such words. It is no matter for congratulation, for it is by no means clear by what, if any, religious influence its place can be taken; but it is matter of certainty that one of the results of the war now devastating the world will be a notable weakening of and falling away from the Roman Catholic Church.

Since the above was written, attention has been drawn by two exceptionally well informed English writers, Mr. Richard Bagot and Dr. E. J. Dillon, to the thinly veiled hostility of the Vatican to the Allies and to the ideas which the Alliance represents. Their papers, which appear respectively in the *Fortnightly Review*, May, 1915, "The Vatican and the War," and in the *Contemporary Review*, May, 1915, "The Pope and the Belligerents," deserve careful study. The former quotes the answer of a great Roman official, given with a shrug of the shoulders, when the massacre of priests and the rape of nuns which follow the track of the German army in

Belgium were brought to his notice by an agent of the Belgian Government: "Que voulez-vous, Monsignore? Ce sont les épisodes de la guerre."

The *Tablet*, alive to the fact that, under the circumstances, infallibility needs a defender, steps into the breach (May 1, 1915) with an apologetic article, "Infallibility and the German Atrocities"; the importance of which lies not in the defence put forward, which is thin and sophistical enough, but in the admission that a defence is required.

THE CONFLICT OF MORAL OBLIGATION IN THE TRILOGY OF AESCHYLUS

BENJAMIN APTHORP GOULD FULLER

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

It will be generally admitted, I think, that Aeschylus is one of the great religious and philosophic poets of all time. And it will be perhaps hardly less generally conceded that no philosophic problem was for him more interesting or more momentous than that of establishing and defending the concept of a moral government of the world. Even those who accuse him of having subjected all things to the iron rule of Fate cannot reproach him with a blind fatalism. If he saw inexorable Necessity at the heart of the world, he also saw Justice writ large upon its face; and if he believed God and man alike to be pawns in the hands of Destiny, the rule of the game was still to punish the wrong moves of the one by the sure interposition of the other.

The question of this reputed fatalism I do not intend to argue. I must content myself with recording my agreement with those who find in Aeschylus an exponent of the freedom of the will. But it will not be amiss to add at the same time the warning that to him, as to his contemporaries, the problem of freedom had not occurred in the form in which it confronts us. The possibility in any given choice of a metaphysical "indifference" of the will to all antecedent motives was a point which had not been raised. Freedom and responsibility dwelt in the realm of feeling pure and simple, and were regarded as non-existent or existent according as a choice did or did not seem to the agent to be made under outer compulsion.

But if Aeschylus is not a fatalist, he is something far more terrible. He may leave his characters their freedom, but he leads them into situations where its exercise is intolerable. He confronts them again and again with dilemmas where there is a conflict of duties such that while a choice is morally imperative, none is morally possible. Fidelity to one obligation involves disloyalty to another equally solemn. The divine law bids and forbids in the same breath. If honour is to stand, it must be rooted in dishonour. Under such circumstances freedom is far more dreadful than Fate.

It is largely by the use of this device, I think, that Aeschylus arrives at his effect of extraordinary grandeur. Each of the three great tragedians had his way of transmuting the baser elements of the ancient legends into the pure gold (perhaps in the case of Euripides it is silver) of high and noble tragedy. In the very act of discrediting a story or of protesting against a conception of the good which appeared to him unworthy, Euripides would transfuse into them the life-blood of human experience, with all its pulse and glow of passion and emotion and motive. Sophocles accepted all, and transfigured all in a vision "under the aspect of eternity," where things were no longer what they seemed, but one and all asserted eternal Providence. Aeschylus, on the contrary, viewing history, as he did, as the display of a divine Justice to whose law all other laws, physical and moral, were subservient, discredited nothing and transfigured nothing. He found rather in the past, however primitive and barbarous its legends, a cumulative justification of the ways of God to men. But what was dark and low in the ancient myths he raised and illumined for all time, not only by making their tale of suffering an account of the due wages of sin, but also by showing behind sin itself the struggle and agony of conflicting yet divinely imposed obligations, and by displaying

his characters neither as playthings of blind Fate nor as sacrifices to the incomprehensible purposes of the gods, but as victims of their own freedom. Guilt for him is not a sudden and wanton thing. It is the slow inclination of the balance after long wavering. Duty is weighed against duty in the scales, not pure good against unmitigated evil. The deed can justify itself in part, for the moral situation involved in it presents a dilemma, where the victim can only do what is right and morally enjoined from one point of view by doing what is wrong and forbidden from another. Hence the crime about which the tragic situation centres is never wholly villainous. Of the impulses of which it is the result some at least are noble. And the decision which ensues, criminal though it may be, is felt and justified by the agent as having been compelled by a moral obligation. The tragic character of the fault then lies in the perversion of the will, not by a wholly evil motive but by a false estimation of the true weight and worth of the conflicting aspects under which the right presents itself.

It is my object to trace briefly in the *Agamemnon* and *Choephori* of Aeschylus the evolution of a series of these conflicts of duty in what I believe to be an ascending scale from a lesser to a greater degree of balance, culminating in a complete equilibrium of obligations. I shall then discuss the solution offered by the poet in the *Eumenides* to the moral problem which such a situation presents.

It will be well, by way of preface, first to remind ourselves of a factor in the Trilogy second only in dramatic importance to the balancing of obligations. This is Aeschylus' treatment of the ancient motive of a family Curse, arising in some primal sin and haunting the doomed race from generation to generation, ever turning new crime to the punishment of old, and again ever making its instruments in their turn the objects of its vengeance.

This Curse is conceived not as an internal taint, but as an external and semi-personal agent. It is a δαίμων γένναs, a συλλήπτωρ πάτροθεν, an ἀλάστωρ, a family ghost, descending from father to son, a spirit of vengeance patiently biding its time to repay itself out of the fortunes of the living for the misdeeds of the dead. Its victims, however, are never innocent. The children are not punished for the sins of the fathers. Whatever the idea may have been in earlier and cruder times, as it appears in Aeschylus' mind it is purged, deliberately perhaps, of any implication of beliefs like the Hebrew teaching of the visitation of the sins of the fathers upon the innocent children, or the Christian doctrine of original sin. For Aeschylus, the children contract the ancestral doom not through heredity but of their own free and sinful will. Those among them that are pure in heart escape. But if they incline to evil ways, the Curse enters in through their propensity to sin and infects them. Their wickedness, for which they and they alone are responsible, it then turns to the service of the divine justice. Through their deeds it exacts repayment—an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth—of the debt of ancient wrong; but the very acts by which justice is done heap up a new debt and become in their turn, because conceived in sin, the occasion of fresh retaliation. Thus perpetuated, the Curse descends from generation to generation.

It is under the menace of such a haunting family Curse that we find the house of Atreus at the beginning of the Trilogy. In olden times Atreus and Thyestes had fled from their father Pelops to Argos, where Atreus married Aerope the daughter of King Eurystheus, and later ruled in his stead. But Thyestes committed adultery with his brother's wife, and was banished from Argos. He returned, however, and sought sanctuary at the altar. Atreus, fearing to put him to death, for vengeance

murdered certain of his children and served them to him at a feast. But when Thyestes discovered the deed, he laid a curse upon Atreus and his children, that they too should perish miserably.

We come now to that portion of the story upon which the Trilogy is based. Agamemnon and Menelaus, the sons of Atreus, married the daughters of Leda, Clytemnestra and Helen. Helen was carried off by Paris, son of Priam, and for her sake the two kings led the hosts of the Achaeans against Troy. But the expedition was held becalmed at Aulis through the will of the goddess Artemis, who was angered against Agamemnon because he had slain a doe sacred to her, and she demanded for her appeasement the sacrifice of his daughter Iphigeneia. And Agamemnon in the end consented to the sacrifice. So Troy was at last besieged, and after ten years' time taken.

Meantime Clytemnestra, left behind in Argos, took Aegisthus the youngest son of Thyestes as her paramour. Because of her passion for him and her wrath at the death of Iphigeneia, she plotted to kill Agamemnon on his return. Meanwhile she sent away their son Orestes to King Strophius of Phocis to be brought up far away. And when Agamemnon returned from Troy, she and Aegisthus murdered him and reigned in Argos.

But Orestes, when he was grown, heard of his father's shameful death, and went to Delphi to inquire of the oracle what he should do. And Apollo bade him avenge his father's death upon his mother. So he went secretly to Argos and slew both Clytemnestra and Aegisthus. Then the Furies of his mother seized upon him, and maddened him and drove him forth over the whole earth in search of purification from the stain of his deed. At last he came again to Delphi, and was promised there that he should find release from his suffering at Athens. So he went to Athens still hounded by

the Furies of Clytemnestra. Then Apollo and the Furies disputed his guilt before certain citizens of Athens and the goddess Athena as jury. The Athenians were equally divided, but Athena gave her vote for acquittal. Therefore Orestes was released.

But the Furies were angry with the goddess and with Athens, and threatened to wreak their vengeance upon the Athenians and depart from the land. Athena, however, placated them with promises of great honor in the city, and a shrine near her own temple. So they put aside their wrath and were henceforth known and worshipped, not as Erinyes or Furies, but as Eumenides or Gracious Ones. As for Orestes, he went back to Argos, and the Curse on the house of Atreus ceased.

With this story in mind let us now turn back to the first play in the Trilogy, the *Agamemnon*. The shadow of the Curse—a shadow both of past and coming events—falls darkly across its opening pages. In the first chorus the prophecy of the soothsayer Calchas is fraught with sinister meaning. The omens—two eagles rending a hare big with young—predict indeed the final success of the expedition against Troy. But they also recall the accursed feast which Atreus set before Thyestes, and Agamemnon's own slaying of the sacred doe, and the wrath of Artemis. Again, they dimly forewarn against the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, and the murder of Agamemnon at the hands of Clytemnestra and her paramour.

> Go forth, he cried, and Priam's town shall fall.
> Yet long the time shall be; and flock and herd,
> The people's wealth, that roam before the wall,
> Shall force hew down, when Fate shall give the word.
>
> But O beware! lest wrath in Heaven abide,
> To dim the glowing battle-forge once more,
> And mar the mighty curb of Trojan pride,
> The steel of vengeance, welded as for war!

For virgin Artemis bears jealous hate
  Against the royal house, the eagle-pair,
Who rend the unborn brood, insatiate—
  Yea, loathes their banquet on the quivering hare.

(Ah woe and well-a-day! but be the issue fair!)

For well she loves—the goddess kind and mild—
  The tender new-born cubs of lions bold,
Too weak to range—and well the sucking child
  Of every beast that roams by wood and wold.

So to the Lord of Heaven she prayeth still,
  "Nay, if it must be, be the omen true!
Yet do the visioned eagles presage ill;
  The end be well, but crossed with evil too!"

Healer Apollo! be her wrath controll'd,
  Nor weave the long delay of thwarting gales,
To war against the Danaans and withhold
  From the free ocean-waves their eager sails!

She craves, alas! to see a second life
  Shed forth, a curst unhallowed sacrifice,
'Twixt wedded souls artificer of strife,
  And hate that knows not fear, and fell device.

At home there tarries like a lurking snake,
  Biding its time, a wrath unreconciled,
A wily watcher, passionate to slake
  In blood resentment for a murdered child.

Such was the mighty warning, pealed of yore
  Amid good tidings, such the word of fear,
What time the fateful eagles hovered o'er
  The kings, and Calchas read the omen clear.[1]

In this initial situation we find also the first and least evenly balanced of the series of conflicts of obligation. On the one hand, Agamemnon is assured that the gods approve the expedition against Troy and will eventually

[1] Agamemnon, 124 et seq. The quotations are from Morshead's translation.

crown it with success; on the other, he is reminded of the hereditary Curse hovering vampire-like about his house, and waiting but the invitation of some evil deed to enter in and exact its toll of blood. He acts then both at the behest and in defiance of the prophecy. His decision is right, but it behooves him to see that it be not rash.

All too soon, however, he gives the δριμύς ἀλάστωρ of his race the opening which it seeks. The fleet, launched against Troy, is held by adverse winds at Chalcis in Euboea. The soothsayer announces the wrath of Artemis which can only be appeased by the sacrifice of Iphigeneia. Agamemnon must decide between the failure of the whole Trojan enterprise and the life of his daughter. Like his decision, the conflict of duties preceding it assumes at this point a tragic dignity. On the one side are his fidelity to the cause of his brother Menelaus, his duty to the expedition, and his loyalty to his comrades-at-arms; on the other is his duty to his child. The one obligation can only be fulfilled at the expense of the other. A choice must be made. And Agamemnon chooses wrongly.

Of the sinfulness of that choice, Aeschylus leaves us no doubt. It is prompted by a dire necessity indeed, but it springs from a blinded vision and a hardened heart.

> Thus on his neck he took
> Fate's hard compelling yoke;
> Then in the counter-gale of will abhorr'd, accursed,
> To recklessness his shifting spirit veered.
> Alas that Frenzy, first of ills and worst,
> With evil craft men's souls to sin hath stirred!
> And so he steeled his heart—ah, well-a-day!
> Aiding a war for one false woman's sake,
> His child to slay,
> And with her spilt blood make
> An offering, to speed the ships upon their way.[2]

[2] Agamemnon, 218 et seq.

From this moment Agamemnon's fate is sealed. He has willed the wrong, and the Curse seizes upon him, to make him both the instrument and the object of the law of retaliation. By his deed, the actual sacrifice of his own child, repayment is made for the long-ago murder of the children of Thyestes. But his act is none the less a new sin which will find him out at last. The divine Justice bides its time through all the long years that he moves in splendid security, king of men, captain of the great captains that make war on Troy. Ilium is taken, and the gods grant him a safe and swift return. And then in the hour of final triumph, vengeance comes, sudden and terrible. The acclamations which greet his homecoming die away behind him, as he enters the palace, into that sudden, dreadful moment of silence about which the *Agamemnon* pivots—a moment broken once, and then once again less sharply, by the cry of one wounded unto death.

The murder of Agamemnon by Clytemnestra is presented as the outcome of a more acute and at the same time more evenly balanced conflict of obligations than that which actuates the sacrifice of Iphigeneia. Agamemnon's cause is minimized. In any event it required no pleading. The Greek audience did not need instruction in the duties owed a husband by his wife. On the other hand, the case for Clytemnestra is urged with all the resources of the pleader's and the dramatist's art. Her adultery with Aegisthus, though it is at once poetic justice for the ancient sin of Thyestes and a sufficient and wholly ignoble motive for her crime, is kept almost entirely below the surface of the action, and allowed to contribute only a dark undercurrent to the sweep of events. Again, her righteous anger at the effrontery of Agamemnon in flaunting his own infidelity before her eyes and in commending his latest mistress to her care, is similarly made only a contributory and not a deter-

mining cause. In a word, Aeschylus rejects both the fear of a guilty and the anger of an outraged wife as motives, appropriate and sufficient as either might have been to the ensuing event. The dominant motive he bases fairly and squarely upon a moral relation and a moral obligation. It is the duty incumbent upon a mother to avenge the murder of her child, which inspires Clytemnestra's action. Indeed, for an instant he permits her to stand before us, austere, impersonal, redeemed from her baseness and vindictiveness. Her will and her personality are in abeyance. She is merged with the avenging angel of the Atreidan race, consecrated to the work of the eternal Justice of the world, of which she has been the divinely appointed instrument, and uplifted by the vision of that Justice finally accomplished by her deed and of the shadow of the Curse at last removed forever from the Atreidan house.

I will quote somewhat at length from the great scene between Clytemnestra and the chorus, in which she defends herself:

CHORUS

Grim is his wrath and heavy on our home,
That fiend of whom thy voice has cried,
Alas, an omened cry of woe unsatisfied,
An all-devouring doom!

Ah woe, ah Zeus! from Zeus all things befall—
Zeus the high cause and finisher of all!
Lord of our mortal state, by him are willed
All things, by him fulfilled!

Yet ah my king, my king no more!
What words to say, what tears to pour
Can tell my love for thee!
The spider-web of treachery
She wove and wound thy life around;
And lo! I see thee lie,
And thro' a coward, impious wound
Pant forth thy life and die!

A death of shame—ah woe on woe!
A treach'rous hand, a cleaving blow!

CLYTEMNESTRA

My guilt thou harpest, o'er and o'er!
I bid thee reckon me no more
  As Agamemnon's spouse.
The old Avenger, stern of mood,
For Atreus and his feast of blood,
  Hath struck the lord of Atreus' house,
And in semblance of his wife
  The king hath slain.
Yea, for the murdered children's life
  A chieftain's in requital ta'en.

CHORUS

Thou guiltless of this murder, thou!
  Who dares such thought avow?
Yet it may be, wroth for the parent's deed,
The fiend hath holpen thee to slay the son.
  Dark Ares, god of death, is pressing on
  Thro' streams of blood by kindred shed,
  Exacting the accompt for children dead,
For clotted blood, for flesh on which their sire did feed.

. . . . . .

CLYTEMNESTRA

I deem not that the death he died
  Had overmuch of shame;
For this was he who did provide
  Foul wrong unto his house and name.
His daughter, blossom of my womb,
He gave unto a deadly doom,
Iphigeneia, child of tears.
And as he wrought, even so he fares.
Nor be his vaunt too loud in hell;
For by the sword his sin he wrought,
And by the sword himself is brought
  Among the dead to dwell.

CHORUS

Ah, whither shall I fly?
For all in ruin sinks the kingly hall;
Nor swift device nor shift of thought have I
To 'scape its fall.
A little while the gentler rain-drops fail.
I stand distraught—a ghastly interval—
Till on the roof-tree rings the bursting hail
Of blood and doom. Even now fate whets the steel
On whetstones new and deadlier than of old—
The steel that smites, in Justice' hold,
Another death to deal.
O Earth! that I had lain at rest
And lapped for ever in thy breast,
Ere I had seen my chieftain fall
Within the laver's silver wall,
Low-lying on dishonoured bier!
And who shall give him sepulchre,
And who the wail of sorrow pour?
Woman, 'tis thine no more!
A graceless gift unto his shade
Such tribute, by his murd'ress paid!
Strive not thus wrongly to atone
The impious deed thy hand hath done.

. . . . . .

CLYTEMNESTRA

Peace! for such task is none of thine.
By me he fell, by me he died,
And now his burial rites be mine!
Yet from these halls no mourners' train
Shall celebrate his obsequies.
Only by Acheron's rolling tide
His child shall spring unto his side,
And in a daughter's loving wise
Shall clasp and kiss him once again!

CHORUS

Lo! sin by sin and sorrow dogg'd by sorrow,
And who the end can know?
The slayer of to-day shall die to-morrow;
The wage of wrong is woe.

While Time shall be, while Zeus in heaven is lord,
His law is fixed and stern;
On him that wrought shall vengeance be outpoured,
The tides of doom return.
The children of the curse abide within
These halls of high estate,
And none can wrench from off the home of sin
The clinging grasp of fate.

CLYTEMNESTRA

Now walks thy word aright, to tell
This ancient truth of oracle;
But I with vows of sooth will pray
To him, the power that holdeth sway
O'er all the race of Pleisthenes.
Tho' dark the deed and deep the guilt,
With this last blood my hands have spilt,
I pray thee let thine anger cease!
I pray thee pass from us away
To some new race in other lands,
There, if thou wilt, to wrong and slay
The lives of men by kindred hands.

For me 'tis all-sufficient meed,
Tho' little wealth or power were won,
So I can say, 'Tis past and done.
The bloody lust and murderous,
The inborn frenzy of our house,
Is ended, by my deed![3]

The answer of the chorus is plain. The plea of Clytemnestra is rejected. She is not irresponsible but free, and her decision flows not from the pure springs of duty alone but is tainted by an admixture of baser motives. Her vision of the right has been clouded by fear and anger and lust. She has chosen wrongly. If then she has made of herself the instrument, she has at the same time made of herself a fit object of the Curse. Her deed,

[3] Agamemnon, 1468 et seq.

no less than Agamemnon's, involves the law of retaliation and calls for punishment. And again Justice comes suddenly, at the end of so long and so well-established a security that it has almost seemed as if the gods forgot.

In the murder of Clytemnestra by Orestes we reach the climax of the counterpoising of obligations. The balance is now absolute, considered both morally and dramatically. Filial duty as strictly enjoins Orestes to avenge his father as it forbids him to kill his mother. Natural feeling renders both alternatives equally dreadful. He is in an *impasse* where movement forward or to either side is equally impossible. But to render the horror of the situation complete, his retreat is also cut off. The irony of things is such that indecision is equivalent to decision. Choose he must, for to choose not to choose is to leave Agamemnon unavenged.

With emotion, motive, judgment, and obligation all thus brought to an absolute equilibrium, an outside power is required to tip the scales and precipitate the crisis. But this power cannot be sought in any admixture of base motive. No madness of Ἄτη blinds Orestes' vision. His judgment is not perverted. He faces the full terror of his situation with a clear eye and a pure will. His heart is not hardened by sin but steeled by a divine command. It is to a god whom he turns in his extremity, and it is a god who bids him slay his mother.

CLYTEMNESTRA

Stay, child, and fear to strike. O son, this breast
Pillowed thine head full oft, while, drowsed with sleep,
Thy toothless mouth drew mother's milk from me.

ORESTES (*to his companion Pylades*)

Can I my mother spare? Speak, Pylades.

PYLADES

Where then would fall the hest Apollo gave
At Delphi? where the solemn compact sworn?
Choose thou the hate of all men, not of gods.

ORESTES

Thou dost prevail; I hold thy counsel good.[4]

This intervention of Apollo cannot but suggest the device of the *deus ex machina*. It is inspired, however, by a higher art than that which, justly or unjustly, is attributed to Euripides. It does not pretend to cut a knot which cannot be untangled, and thus to bring matters to a *dénouement*. It rather emphasizes the problem and prepares the way for further treatment of it.

If in turning at length to the *Eumenides* we have to note the substitution of a divine command for the passion and blindness of a sinful heart as a controlling spring of action, we may also find significant the changed method of the punishment of Orestes. The haunting Curse of the house of Atreus has disappeared, and its place has been taken by the avenging Erinyes of Clytemnestra. The continuity of the action, however, is not broken by the transition. In a sense, Orestes is still the victim of the Curse. Its operation accounts for the situation and the dilemma with which he finds himself confronted, and from which there is no escape. And it uses him as the instrument of its vengeance. But it does not perpetuate itself through his act, and mark him out as its victim. The Erinyes replace it as the agents of his punishment.

This substitution, I think, is deliberate, and is intended, along with the substitution of the command of Apollo for the blindness of sin, to raise the question of how far Orestes' deed is to be considered criminal. To have retained the Curse would have been to condemn Orestes

[4] Choephori, 896 et seq.

unheard, and to presuppose that he has sinned, for, as we have seen, the Curse can only operate through an agent already criminally disposed. Moreover, the Curse is an expression of the impersonal Justice inherent in the order of the world, whereas the Erinyes are more personal, and more divorced from the concept of any abstract law of just reparation. They are the spirits of vengeance rather than of justice. They hearken simply to the cry of the wronged and slain for blind revenge, when the slayer has been his kin, and take no heed of the motives and circumstances of the act. They see no further than that to slay one's kin is in any case a wrong for which payment must be made, irrespective of the innocence of the agent. From their pursuit and from the wrath of the ghost of the murdered Clytemnestra, Orestes cannot be freed, whatever the merits of his case may be.

So it is that the Erinyes appear not as judges, but as prosecutors pure and simple, urging their cause *à parti pris*. All their weight is thrown on one arm of the scales. And over against them, as a counterpoise, is Apollo, the defendant, equally partisan. God is arrayed against god. The argument is, as it were, transferred to Heaven, and the conflict of duties involved is raised to a superhuman level and becomes a cosmic problem. At this new height, however, the equilibrium continues to be exactly maintained. There is a curious wrangle which leaves, for us at least, the crux of the question untouched. The Erinyes justify their partisanship and their neglect of the cry of Agamemnon for vengeance (a situation demanded by the dramatic necessities of the play) by arguing that a husband is no blood-relation to his wife. In return, Apollo grounds his championship of Orestes on the plea that a son is no blood-relation to his mother. Just how seriously Aeschylus means to urge these arguments it is impossible to determine. To the modern ear they seem specious. But however

that may be, their very speciousness is of considerable dramatic value. It keeps the situation in suspense. Even on the superhuman and cosmic level the deadlock is still complete.

Another aspect of the situation has provoked criticism. The arguments take place before a human tribunal constituted for the occasion—the Areopagus, presided over by the goddess Athena. It is said that to bring the gods as pleaders before a human law-court and to submit the question at issue to its decision, is weak, and that Aeschylus in his patriotic desire to exalt the Areopagus by attributing its foundation to so august an occasion has fallen into bathos. But after all, whether or not Aeschylus' manipulation of this development in the plot be due to patriotism, is it not also amply justified dramatically? The decision of a case so subtle and so momentous, if it is to be sympathetically accepted and regarded as valid, must not shock the moral sense of the audience. It must appear, not as an incomprehensible decree of the gods, accepted without being understood, but rather as a clarification of the spectator's own perplexity, and a revelation to him of his own real feeling and judgment in the matter. In referring the case to the Areopagus, Aeschylus is but referring it to his audience, and asking for their solution of the problem. And the tie in the Areopagus is a reflection of their inability to take sides and to break the deadlock.

It remains for Athena to cast the decisive vote, which she gives in favor of Orestes. But her reason for her action, like the arguments of Apollo and the Erinyes, seems at first sight irrelevant to the deeper moral aspects of the question. She favors Orestes rather than Clytemnestra because, born as she is, directly from the head of Zeus, she has had no mother. But here again we may ask whether her explanation of her course is as beside the point as it appears. The case has now

been carried to the court of final appeal, and has been tested by the divine wisdom and weighed in the flawless scales of absolute Justice. But the divine is no more able than the human tribunal to hand down a decision based upon moral grounds. The moral obligations exactly balance, and hence condemnation and acquittal are equally just. The reason then for the decision must be found in other than moral considerations.

We may also note the inversion of the original dilemma. The very situation which makes it morally obligatory on Orestes to choose between the alternatives presented makes it equally obligatory upon Athena to refrain from choosing. He by a refusal, she by a willingness, to take sides would be committed to the same morally indefensible partisanship. The one by suspending, the other by rendering judgment between the conflicting claims, would register a similar approval of unrighteousness and prove unfaithful to the Moral Law.

This *dénouement* has been attacked as weak. Aeschylus, it is said, gives up the problem in despair as insoluble, and the play ends in an anti-climax, or rather in suspense. But were this true, would not the final episode of the placation of the Erinyes and their transformation into the Eumenides be inexplicable? Would not its dramatic irrelevance to the play as a whole be beyond any possible justification by a patriotic and pious desire to celebrate the institution of the worship of the dread goddesses at Athens?

It is impossible, however, to believe that the transformation of the Erinyes into the Eumenides was not intended to be an integral part of the development of the plot. Aeschylus may be a patriot, but he is also a playwright. And the function of the episode, it seems to me, is clear enough. It serves precisely to indicate the solution of the problem which the poet has in mind. Doubtless he feels that the problem is in a sense insol-

uble, but the very solution lies, to speak paradoxically, in recognizing its insolubility. For after all, how shall Justice, human or divine, deal with a case where the conflicting obligations are equally imperative and equally balanced? Justice must suspend judgment, for it can give no decision without violating itself. To decide either for or against Orestes is equally to nullify the most solemn obligations of filial duty. The gods must take both sides and no side if they are not to contravene the very law of which they are the guardians. Justice, then, in a case where the agent has been the victim of equally balanced moral obligations, lies precisely in not judging. The defendant escapes, not through any positive movement of the moral machinery of the universe in his favour, but through the immobility consequent upon its having reached a dead centre.

This is the thought, it seems to me, which underlies the final episode of the transformation of the Erinyes into the Eumenides and makes it a vital part of the evolution of the drama. When the Erinyes, balked as they think of their legitimate prey, threaten to visit Athens with their wrath, Athena points out that they have not really lost their case, regarded even in its crudest aspect of blind and primitive blood-vengeance. The decision has not gone against them, for no decision as to the merits of the case has been given. Their demand for the punishment of the slayer of Clytemnestra has not been outweighed but merely counterbalanced by the right of the murdered Agamemnon to be avenged. Therefore their anger is without justification.

This, however, is but half of the story. Athena's plea might give perhaps sufficient reason for inducing the Erinyes to depart without molesting the city, but it does not account for their decision to stay and become beneficent tutelary goddesses. The underlying idea of the further argument by which Athena prevails upon them

to remain seems to be that their very failure to exact the penalty demanded of Orestes by the primitive and purely automatic law of blood-vengeance is really their triumph as servants of a higher Justice which takes motives and circumstances into its reckoning. Her invitation to them to become the Eumenides, partners in her task and in her honours, is an appeal to them to become the conscious and comprehending ministers of that Moral Order which hitherto they have descried but dimly and served only in part. Retaliation, to be just, must be allied to wisdom, must be actuated not by what is lowest and most barbarous, but by all that is noblest and most civilized in man.

If the Erinyes will become the Eumenides, if they will accept and serve this higher and civilized Justice which marks the reign of the new gods and is expressed in the acquittal of Orestes, then all will be well. They will be worthy of worship, and will be revered and honoured along with the Reason with which they have allied themselves. If not, they must go. But Athena's threat is veiled. It is by persuasion that the Erinyes are finally won. Justice cannot be established upon violence. The Right can reign, can only be right, if it is based not upon a forced but upon a freely given recognition and homage.

Such I take to be the solution offered by Aeschylus to the problem presented by a balance of conflicting duties. But is there not also a suggestion that this solution is secondary to a harder and deeper task—that of reconciling to the civilization of the poet's day, with its humane and splendid vision of both the nature of the gods and the destiny of man, the old order of barbarism and violence out of which that civilization had so lately arisen? The social conditions and the moral ideals reflected in a concept such as that of the Erinyes had been left behind. If the cult was to endure, it had to be brought

into accordance with the juster views and the nobler sentiments of modern times. Piety and patriotism alike imposed upon Aeschylus the task of transfiguring and ennobling it. This he accomplished by the idea of an evolution of the Erinyes into the Eumenides, which should focus, as it were, the development of primitive and barbaric into the civilized and enlightened Justice of which the final release of Orestes is an example.

The last point gains at least plausibility from its accord with a well-accredited interpretation of the significance of the Trilogy or Tetralogy, of which the *Prometheus Bound* alone is preserved to us. The problem there is to square the old, imperfectly moralized Zeus of the Homeric and Hesiodic canon and of the *Prometheus Bound* with the all-just and all-holy Zeus of the great choruses in the *Agamemnon* and the *Suppliant Maidens.* The key to the difficulty, it has been suggested, lies in the idea of an evolution of the character of Zeus. Aeschylus reconciles the old canonical story to the demands of a maturer ethics by representing Zeus as growing, just as man has grown, out of the old reign of violence and brute force into that conformity with the moral ideal in which the divinity of the gods alone consists, and upon which their sway over the hearts of men depends.

There may be then a deeper affinity between the *Eumenides* and the *Prometheus* than is patent at first sight. Both plays perhaps really express the same idea, are occupied with the same problem, and propose the same answer. But one is not warranted in presenting such a suggestion, nor for that matter perhaps this Paper as a whole, in more than a tentative and interrogatory spirit.

FRA SALIMBENE AND THE FRANCISCAN IDEAL

EPHRAIM EMERTON

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

One of the most engaging personalities of that most engaging of Christian centuries, the thirteenth, is Brother Salimbene of Parma. His life, begun in 1221, five years before the death of Francis of Assisi and ended, probably, about 1288, thirteen years after the birth of Dante, connects the mystical, devotional, ascetic piety of the Middle Ages with the rational, individualistic, personal attitude of the modern mind. A devoted member of the Franciscan Order and acutely sensitive to its historic significance, he spends his life in its manifold activities, and toward the close sets himself to the congenial task of putting down in order the most vivid impressions remaining to him of the men and things he has had dealings with.

The result is the famous Chronicle, now for the first time presented to the learned world in an edition worthy of the best traditions of modern editorial thoroughness and exactness.[1] It was a fortunate chance that brought the work of this Italian, concerned almost entirely with the affairs of his own country and his own Order, within the scope of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* and thus into the trained hands of the late Professor Oswald Holder-Egger. As an Italian patriot, citizen of a Lombard commune, and devoted servant of the papal system, Salimbene regarded the emperor—or, as after 1245 he always called him, the *quondam* emperor—Frederic II as the embodiment of all evil. He loses no opportunity of describing, often in considerable detail, this plague of

[1] Chronica fratris Salimbene de Adam ordinis Minorum, ed. Oswald Holder-Egger in Monumenta Germaniae Historica, SS. XXXII. MDCCCCV–MDCCCCXIII.

Italy, this implacable enemy and ultimate victim of the sacred Papacy. His work is, therefore, at many points a direct contribution to German imperial history and as such belongs properly in the majestic collection of the *Monumenta*.

The original of the Chronicle exists in but one manuscript, and that an imperfect one, in the Vatican Library. It has long been known and partially exploited by scholars, but heretofore has been edited but once, in 1857 at Parma in a fragmentary and altogether unsatisfactory fashion.[2] The present work leaves little to be desired for completeness, accuracy, and elegance of form. In several beautiful facsimiles of the manuscript we are able to admire the painstaking care of the author—who was unmistakably his own amanuensis—the uniformity of his characters, the regularity of his abbreviations, and his sense of decorative effect. A companion piece to this final edition of the original text is the German translation by Professor Doren of Leipzig, of which only the first volume, covering about half of the original, has appeared. Dr. Doren has fully appreciated the vast difficulties of putting into modern form the singularly varied and altogether individual mode of expression which makes the charm of Salimbene's narrative, but he has gone far toward realizing the ideal of a good translation. He has striven to represent the spirit of his text, and with considerable success. If at times he glides rather too easily over the rough places, he at least avoids the error of too bold conjecture. Until some competent hand shall take up the task of giving us a complete version in English, these handy volumes of Dr. Doren will be the readiest means of making acquaintance with the genial friar.[3]

[2] Chronica Fr. Salimbene Parmensis ex codice Vaticanae nunc primum edita Parmae MDCCCLVII.

[3] Die Chronik des Salimbene von Parma nach der Ausgabe der Monumenta Germaniae, bearbeitet von Alfred Doren. Leipzig, 191.

In saying this we are not forgetting the praiseworthy attempt of Mr. G. G. Coulton, who already in 1906, using presumably the first part of the present volume, which had appeared the year before, and also advance sheets of later parts, produced his attractive study called *From St. Francis to Dante*.[4] He undertook to give, to use his own words, "a translation of all that is of primary interest in the Chronicle of the Franciscan Salimbene." Mr. Coulton's work is well done and will be satisfactory for all those readers who are willing to let some one else decide what is "of primary interest" and also what is suited for ears polite. After all, when we have finished, it is Mr. Coulton's book we have been reading with a somewhat flattened Salimbene as its illustration.

Salimbene is an instructive instance of the impossibility of drawing sharp lines between the great periods of human progress. Mediaeval in his faith, in his class spirit, in his childlike indifference to observed facts, in his utter incapacity to estimate the value of evidence, he is modern in his intense interest in himself and all that belongs to him. We call him a "chronicler" and his work a "chronicle," but he was as far as possible from being a systematic recorder of events in their regular sequence. He does, indeed, follow a general chronological order, but this is nothing more than a very meagre scaffolding on which he clambers up and down at will, with excursions on side lines whenever the temptation offers. If we can believe his own words, the motive to his literary activity was the desire of a niece, a nun, daughter of his elder Franciscan brother, to know more about her ancestry and incidentally about the world activities in which they had been engaged. The good uncle proceeds, therefore, to satisfy this laudable curiosity; but first he must go back and furnish a background of general historical information. His sources

[4] From St. Francis to Dante, G. G. Coulton, M.A. London, 1906.

for this early narrative are fairly easy to trace, and the inquiry into these sources has been valuable in clearing up many hitherto obscure points of critical scholarship.

Perhaps the most vivid impression we receive from Salimbene's story is that of the real motive of the monastic or the fraternal life. The ideal of the true mediaeval monasticism was an ideal of separation from the life of the world, primarily for the good of the separated soul. Yet even in this earlier period nothing is clearer than that such separation affected chiefly such commonplace characters as would have been of little account in any social scheme. The man of capacity in any form was not allowed to rust in the stupid routine of the cloister. The "world" he had affected to despise and appeared to desert called him with myriad voices, and through precisely these earlier centuries there is no more familiar figure than the aggressive monk, active in all the ways open to any of his contemporaries, none the less a fighter in the world's battle because he did not—ordinarily—wield the weapons of the flesh. The history of monastic "reform" throughout the Middle Ages is nothing more or less than the ever renewed but ever fruitless protest against these worldly activities. Only in one respect was the principle of separation fully maintained, in the absolute rejection of the family as the basis of social activity and the substitution for it of a self-perpetuating, self-sustaining community. Certainly in our own day, when a similar menace to the family is becoming more and more acute, we ought to understand more sympathetically than ever the peculiar attraction of this peculiarly mediaeval institution.

The mediaeval monastic ideal had been separation from the world, but against this there had never been lacking the kind of protest which at last culminated in the great new departure of the Mendicants. The Franciscans and Dominicans, or, to use the terms by

which Salimbene invariably calls them, the Minorites and the Preachers, alike in their common rejection of the principle of bodily "inclusion" differed only in their specialization of functions. The Franciscan professed to supplement the work of his predecessors on the side of practical benevolence, the Dominican on the side of learned exhortation to moral duty. But both alike continued the rejection of the family as the ideal unit of social efficiency. In the story of Salimbene we have a graphic illustration of this persistent antagonism. His family was of ancient and honorable station. Father and mother were living. An older brother, married and a father, had already been swept into the current of spiritual enthusiasm that was carrying the youth of Italy away from the safe moorings of civic tradition into many varieties of ecstatic religious experience, and had joined the Franciscan Order. Young Ognibene—as he was then called—in his eighteenth year fell into the same net. He was the third and youngest son, the last hope of his father's house. He knew his parents would disapprove, and so he slipped away from home and found shelter in the local Franciscan house, to be sent afterward to several other and safer retreats. Let him tell the story in his own words:—

"So long as he lived, my father grieved over my entrance into the order of the Minorites and refused to be comforted, because he had no son to succeed him in his inheritance. He made a complaint to the emperor (Frederic II), who was at Parma at the time, that the Minorites had taken away his son. Thereupon the emperor ordered Brother Elias, Minister General of the Order, as he valued his favor, to send me back to my father. After that, my father went to Assisi, where Brother Elias was, and gave the emperor's letter into his hands. As soon as he had read it, Brother Elias gave him an order to the brethren of the house at Fano where I then was, charging them upon their obedience to hand me over to my father at once, if I desired it; but otherwise, if I was unwilling to go, they should hold me precious as the apple of their eyes.

"So a number of gentlemen [*milites*] came with my father to the house of the brethren at Fano to see the outcome of my affair, and I was made a spectacle for them, but they a means of salvation for me. When the brethren and lay members were gathered in the chapter-house a great deal of talk went on back and forth, and then my father brought out the letter of the Minister General and showed it to the brethren. Brother Jeremiah, the Custos, read it aloud to them all and replied to my father: 'Sir Guido, we are sorry for your grief, and we are ready to obey the orders of our Father; but here is your son; he is of age, let him speak for himself. Ask him if he wishes to go with you, and if so, let him go, in God's name! But if he will not, we cannot compel him to go.' So my father asked me whether I would go with him or not. And I answered, 'No! For the Lord says, *No man having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the Kingdom of God.*' Then my father said, 'Have you no thought for your father and mother, who are in great trouble on your account?' And I said, 'No indeed, I have no thought for you! For the Lord says, *He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me.* And He says of you too, *He that loveth son or daughter more than me, etc.* It is you, father, who ought to be thinking of Him who for our sakes hung upon the cross, that He might give us eternal life.'

"Then the brethren rejoiced that I spoke thus to my father, but he said to them, 'You have bewitched my son and deceived him into refusing me. I will complain again to the emperor against you and your Minister too. But now let me talk with my son apart from you, and you will see that he will come with me fast enough.' So the brethren allowed me to speak with my father apart from them, because from what I had already said they had quite a little confidence in me; but they listened behind the wall, for they were trembling like a reed in the water lest my father with his blandishments might change my purpose, and they were afraid, not only for the safety of my soul, but lest my withdrawal might keep others from entering the Order. Then my father said, 'My dear son, don't trust these petticoated knaves! They have been fooling you. Come with me, and I will give you everything I have.' Then I answered and said to my father, 'Go, father, go! For the Wise Man says, Prov. iii. 27, *Prevent not him from well-doing who is able, and if thou canst, do well thyself.*' And he answered me with tears and said, 'What shall I say to your mother, who grieves for you without ceasing?' I said to him, 'Say to her from me, Thus says your son, Ps. 26, *When my father and my mother forsake me,*

then the Lord will take me up.' And when my father heard all these things, in despair of my return he threw himself on the ground before the brethren and the laymen who had come with him and said, 'A thousand devils take you, accursed son! and your brother here, who has befooled you! My curse be upon you both forever, and may it bring you to the infernal spirits!' And he went out in a violent passion; but we remained greatly comforted, giving thanks to our God and saying to each other, '*Let them curse, but bless thou*', Ps. 108. The laymen went away powerfully edified by my perseverance; but the brethren rejoiced mightily because God had done manfully through me his little child.

"The following night the blessed Virgin gave me my reward. For I seemed to be lying before an altar in prayer, as the brethren are wont to do when they rise for matins. And I heard the voice of the blessed Virgin calling to me, and lifting up my face I saw the blessed Virgin seated upon the altar where the Host stands and the Cup, and she had her child in her bosom and held him out to me and said, 'Fear not! but come and kiss my son, whom to-day you have confessed before men.' And when I was afraid, behold! the child opened his arms eagerly awaiting me; and so trusting in the eagerness and the innocence of the boy and the wide charity of his mother, I approached and embraced and kissed him. And the gentle mother left him to me for a long time; but when I could not have enough of him, the holy Virgin blessed me and said, 'Go, dear son, and rest, that the brethren who are rising to matins find thee not here with us.' So I complied and the vision left me; but in my heart there remained an indescribable sweetness, such as I have never felt in the world."

Once more Salimbene tells with the same gusto of a renewed attempt to bring him to some notion of respect for his family obligations. Five years after his entrance into the Order there came to him certain clowns (*ystriones*) who were called "knights of the court" (*milites de curia*), "but I cared no more for them than for the fifth wheel of a coach. One said to me, 'Your father sends his greetings, and your mother says, if she might but see you for one day, she would gladly die the next.' He thought he was giving me a powerful motive for a change of purpose; but I said to him in anger, 'Away with you, you wretch! I won't hear another word. My father is an Amorite

and my mother a Hittite!' (Ezek. 16 3). So he went away in confusion and never came back again."

This is the view of his monastic vocation which Brother Salimbene, writing some forty years later, desired to impress upon the world—perhaps upon himself. It is of interest as giving fairly both sides of the problem, the claim of the world as well as the summons to the "higher life." The detail is almost purely conventional—the heartbroken parents, their appeal to the highest secular authority, the trembling boldness of the brethren, saving their case by throwing the responsibility upon the novice himself, the glib priggishness of the boy with his pat quotations from Scripture, and finally the consoling vision of the Madonna—it must have been a dull student indeed of saintly literature who out of these elements could not weave an appealing story. The valuable part of it is its dramatic presentation of a world conflict. After all, the "world," including the supreme representative of earthly power, had to give way before the passive resistance of a handful of friars strong only in their loyalty to a false ideal of society.

A curious side-light is thrown upon the youth's actual feeling at the time in a later passage where Salimbene, speaking of the Emperor Frederic, says, "I have seen him and at one time liked him [*dilexi*]; for he wrote in my behalf [*pro me*] to Brother Elias, Minister General of the Minorite Brethren, directing him, as he valued his favor, to give me back to my father." Did the memory of the aging friar slip back to what was his honest state of mind during his novitiate, and is the earlier account just given only a bit of pious "literature"?

While Salimbene was still a very young man in the Franciscan house at Pisa he became greatly interested in the writings, genuine and spurious, of the Abbot Joachim of Floris, who in the generation preceding had caught the imagination of Young Italy by an interpre-

tation of Christianity as a phase in the development of that "Eternal Gospel" which had always been fulfilling itself in stages corresponding to the dispensations of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Joachim's mystical temper appealed powerfully to our young brother, and he became an avowed follower of the Calabrian prophet. Joachim himself appears to have preserved a certain caution in his prophetic function; for Salimbene says that he never set definite dates of fulfilment, leaving it to those who should be living at the time to see his exact meaning. Some of his interpreters, however, were less careful, and it was the failure of some of Joachim's alleged prophesies which finally broke the historian's faith in him.

The nature of the Joachite methods is well shown in a spirited scene at the Franciscan house at Hyères while Salimbene was a visitor there. He had come to Hyères chiefly to hear Brother Hugh of Digna discuss about Joachim, and the opportunity came in this way. Two Dominicans were waiting in the town for a favorable chance to take ship, and one day after dinner a brother of the house asked one of these, named Peter, what he thought of the doctrine of Abbot Joachim.

"Brother Peter answered, 'I care no more for Joachim than for the fifth wheel of a coach [a favorite simile of our author]. Why, even Gregory [I] believed that the end of the world was near in his day because the Lombards had come and were destroying everything before them.' So the brother ran to Brother Hugh's room where he was surrounded by jurists and notaries and scientists [*phisici*] and other scholars and said to him, 'There is a certain Dominican here who does not believe a word of that doctrine of yours.' Brother Hugh said, 'What is it to me if he doesn't? Let him take the consequences. However, invite him to a discussion and let us hear his reasons for doubting.' So the Dominican came, but unwillingly, partly because he had so low an opinion of Joachim, partly because he did not believe there was any one in that house who could compare with himself in learning or in knowledge of Scripture. When Brother Hugh saw him he said, 'Are you the man who doubts the teaching of Joachim?' 'Indeed I am,' an-

swered Brother Peter. 'Have you ever read Joachim?' said Brother Hugh. 'I have indeed and thoroughly too.' 'Yes, I've no doubt you have read him, as a woman reads her psalter, and when she gets to the end forgets what she read at the beginning. That's the way many people read and don't understand, either because they despise what they are reading or because their ignorant hearts are darkened. Now then, tell me what you would like to hear about Joachim.' 'I should like to hear you prove from the prophet Isaiah, as Joachim teaches, that the life of the emperor Frederic is to end after seventy years—for he is still alive—and also that he cannot be slain except by God, i.e. not by a violent death, but only by a natural one.' Brother Hugh answered, 'Gladly; but you must listen patiently and not with shouting and objections, for in this doctrine the inquirer must have faith.' Abbot Joachim was a holy man, and he says that his predictions were revealed to him by God for the benefit of men.

"As to the holy life of Joachim, besides what is found in his 'legend' we can prove it by an instance of his exceeding patience. Before he became abbot, while he was still under discipline, a serving brother who had a grudge against him filled his drinking-cup regularly for a whole year with water, and he bore it with patience, making no complaint. But when, toward the close of the year, he was sitting one day next the abbot at table, the abbot said to him, 'How is it that you are drinking white wine and haven't offered me any? Is that your idea of politeness?' To which the saintly Joachim replied, 'I was ashamed to offer it to you, my Father, because this is a secret of mine.' Then the abbot lifted Joachim's cup to try it, tasted of it, and found he had made a bad bargain. Then when he found that it was water not made wine he said, 'What is water but water? Who gave you permission to drink such a beverage as this?' Joachim answered, 'Father, water is a sober drink, it doesn't trip the tongue, nor cause drunkenness nor much speaking.' But when the abbot learned in the Chapter that this insulting revenge was due to the malice and ill temper of the serving brother, he was minded to turn him out of the Order; but Joachim threw himself at his feet and begged that he would not punish the lay brother with expulsion."

The poor fellow was let off with a severe reprimand and the penalty of drinking water for a year in his turn. The argument is obvious. A person of such distinguished humility must be worthy of all acceptance in the rôle of

prophet! There follows a long disputation, in which Brother Hugh defends the principle of prophecy even through the mouths of evil men or, still stranger, through heathen agents. Poor Brother Peter gets the worst of it, of course, overcome by the amazing learning and readiness of his opponent.

The discussion is broken off by the announcement that the expected ship is ready to sail, and the two Dominicans hurry away without so much as saying good-bye. After their departure Brother Hugh said to the rest who had heard the discussion, "Don't take it ill of me if I have said some things I ought not to have said, for debaters are apt to be led into extremes by their excitement;" and he added, "These good people are always bragging about their learning, and saying that in their Order is the fountain-head of wisdom. And they say they have been among fools when they have been in the houses of the Minorites, where they have been most kindly entertained. But, by the grace of God, they weren't able to say this time that they had been among fools, for I have done as the Wise Man says in Proverbs—'answered a fool according to his folly.'"

Salimbene can never resist the temptation to take a fling at the Dominicans, especially to ridicule their claim to superior learning. Yet he has a sincere respect for them as, after all, sharing with his own Franciscans the character of honest mendicancy. It gives him solid comfort to find in his precious Joachim, who died in 1202, the obvious prophecy of two great twin Orders, who are to realize the prototypes set forth in the interpretation of the prophet Jeremiah then attributed to his Calabrian successor. It is of no importance, so far as Salimbene's faith in his master is concerned, that this interpretation is now believed not to be the work of Joachim. Some of these prototypes are the crow and the dove—since the Dominicans are all black and the

Franciscans parti-colored; the two angels sent at evening to Sodom before its destruction; Esau and Jacob; Joseph and Benjamin; Moses and Aaron; the two spies sent by Joshua to Jericho; Peter and John going to the sepulchre, of whom it is said "the two ran together," etc. And again comes the sly dig at the Dominicans. The Abbot Joachim thought the Dominicans were prefigured by Peter because, when Peter and John were going up to the temple at the ninth hour, it was Peter who said, "Silver and gold have I none," although John was as poor as he and deserved just as much credit for his poverty. Now the Dominicans are always claiming every praiseworthy thing for themselves and therefore they must have been prefigured in the character of Peter. "Nor is that passage in John [xx]—'the two ran together'—without its mystery, for at the same time and under the same pope, Innocent III, both Orders began. In the tenth year of the pontificate of Innocent III, the year 1207, the blessed Francis began the Order of the Minorites." So far so good; but it is amusing to see how Salimbene's desire to chaff the Dominicans gets the better of his own chronology: "And where it is said, '*That other disciple outran Peter and came first to the sepulchre, but did not enter in*,' that means that the Order of the Minorites appeared in the world first in the above-named year; but the blessed Dominic began the Order of the Preachers in the year 1216 under Pope Honorius III."

So in the reference to Jacob and Esau: "The Order which was prefigured by Esau went to the daughters of Heth, i.e. to the secular sciences, as, for example, to Aristotle and other philosophers. This is the Order of Preachers, prefigured in the crow, not as to the blackness of their sins but as to their dress. But Jacob, a plain man, dwelt in tents. This was the Order of Minorites, who at the beginning of their appearance in the world gave themselves to prayer and contemplation."

But this very devotion of Salimbene to the two great Orders, no matter how severely he might criticise the shortcomings of individual members, made him fiercely intolerant of all imitators. It is obvious that the apparently easy lives of the begging friars would attract many of the unemployed, and there seemed no good reason why Orders should not be multiplied as far as the patience or the superstition of the well-to-do could be stretched. Salimbene gives us vivid sketches of several such attempts which came under his own observation. The leaders were usually disappointed candidates for one of the great Orders. One such applied to Brother Hugh at Hyères; but that clever person told him, if he felt the call to poverty, to "go into the woods and learn to eat roots, for the time of tribulation was at hand." The fellow, however, was not looking for that kind of poverty. He got together a band of loafers like himself, who clothed themselves in striped mantles and began to beg. "For," confesses Salimbene, "we and the Preaching Brethren have taught all the world to beg, and all kinds of people are putting on gowns and making mendicant rules for themselves."

These particular specimens were called in derision by the neighboring Franciscans "Men of the Woods," by others "Sack Brothers," from their peculiar dress. They seem to have enjoyed a certain vogue for about twenty-five years, but were abolished by a general order of Pope Gregory X in 1274. No wonder that a certain lady of Modena said, as she saw these beggars going from door to door, "We had bags and satchels enough before to empty our store-houses without these Brethren of the Sack!"

Another similar movement had its origin at Parma while Salimbene was living there. He begins his account of it with a sufficiently clear description of its "charter-members." "That congregation of loose fel-

lows, swineherds, fools, and clowns 'who call themselves Apostles and are not so, but are the Synagogue of Satan'; for they are of no use in preaching or chanting the service or celebrating Mass or hearing confession or teaching in school or giving good counsel or even saying prayers for their benefactors, because they are running about town all day making eyes at the women. How they serve the Church of God or are useful to Christian folk I cannot see. They spend their whole time wandering idly about; they neither work nor pray."

The leader of this troop was one Gerardino Segalelli, a townsman of Salimbene, "of low origin, unlearned, a layman, a clown [*ydiota*], and a fool." He had tried to join the Franciscans, but being refused he "hung about the church of the Brethren planning the foolish scheme which he afterwards carried out." Like all the imitators, says Salimbene, he tried to copy the Franciscan dress, let his hair and beard grow long, sold his bit of a house and scattered the price of it, not among the poor but among the loose fellows of the place, who spent it forthwith in gambling, blaspheming the living God. But, not satisfied with emulating the virtues of Francis, he wanted to be like the Son of God, and so had himself circumcised and went about making extravagant claims to chastity, but deceiving unsuspecting women. He trotted about Parma alone—this was one of his sins—saluting no one, but crying out at intervals "Repenshe! Repenshe!"; for he did not know how to say "Repent ye," and his followers after a time spoke in the same way, because they were country folk and simpletons [*ydiote*]. Salimbene gives several detailed accounts of individuals who tried their fortunes with these "apostles" to the scandal of their several communities, goes on to state three reasons why the "apostles" are not in a state of salvation, and then enumerates twelve specific forms of foolishness which they display. In this enumeration we find a general

summary of the author's views as to the true position of Orders in the Church.

First, they neither fear God nor honor man; for when Pope Gregory declared their association, as well as that of the Sack Brethren, dissolved, the latter obeyed, taking on no more members, so that they gradually died out, but "these fools, beasts and simpletons took no notice of the papal order but kept on increasing their numbers, and," says Salimbene, "they will never cease from their folly until some other supreme pontiff shall wipe out their memory from the earth." Secondly, some of them do not practise chastity, to which all *religiosi* are bound and which our Lord taught by word and example. Thirdly, some of them do not keep the vow of poverty, but after selling their property keep the money for scandalous uses. "Now observe," says Salimbene, "that these three things are the basis of all 'religions,' without which there can be no salvation for a '*religiosus*'; in fact, if one lacks any one of these he can in no way be called a '*religiosus.*'"

The twelve kinds of foolishness of the "apostles" are their lack of a head, their wandering about alone, their idleness, want of discipline, failure to teach their novices the rule of life, "which is a great folly, for whereas beasts and birds have at once by nature what they require, the soul of man is created by God as a *tabula rasa* and therefore needs instruction." They live around from house to house, "which is a vile life." They give up the work for which they are fitted, namely, herding cows and pigs, cleaning out vaults and tilling the ground, thrusting themselves into work for which they have no fitness, namely, teaching and preaching.

Here Salimbene darts off at a tangent to describe his own studies from earliest childhood. He had never ceased studying, and now, at the age of sixty-three, "I may say in truth with Socrates, 'This only I know—

that I know nothing.' But those untaught fools and ribald fellows who call themselves 'apostles' want to preach without learning, having neither knowledge of Scripture nor good morals nor an upright life; but they go about the world making fools of themselves and sowing the seeds of heresy. It is as if a bird should try to fly without wings or a lame man to walk without feet." It particularly offends Salimbene that these precious knaves should try to outdo the original apostles in the matter of dress. It appears that they thought to acquire merit by obeying literally the apostolic injunction not to take two coats for their journey. This is overdoing it. They claim to know too much. Of course there are limits both ways. It was plainly an extravagance in the other direction for a certain Patriarch of Aquileia to begin Lent with forty courses at dinner, cutting off one every day till Easter, that the honor and glory of his Patriarchate might not be diminished. But that is no reason why these fools should suffer the "torments of vermin which they cannot shake out and of sweat and dust and foul smells, because they cannot shake or wash their one garment unless they go naked. One day a woman told two Minorites that she had a naked 'apostle' in her bed, and there he would have to stay until she had washed and dried his garment. Thereupon the brethren had a good laugh at the stupidity of the woman and of the fool apostle too."

Another offence was that these people begged but gave no alms, keeping all they got, whereas it was the duty of every clerical person to render service in return for the support which the community was bound to give him. The charge that they had taken upon themselves a name far too lofty and noble for their low quality gives Salimbene a chance for one of his excursions into ancient prophecy. These people were not prefigured by any of the numerous twelves and seventies mentioned

in the Scriptures old and new. "Apostle" means "one sent," but these people were not sent by any one. They came of themselves and even refused to obey the papal order to disperse. Putting together all these reflections, we are able to see clearly Salimbene's conception of the Franciscan ideal.

If our chronicler had a hero, it was John of Parma, a fellow Franciscan and during the years 1247 to 1257 Minister General of the Order. Salimbene was proud of him as a townsman, admired him for his many capacities, and revered him as a leader. He devotes to him a considerable section of his recollections and uses him in various ways as a type to express positively the ideal he has just been negatively defending. He gives his account of John largely in quaint anecdotes simply told and bearing the marks of essential accuracy. The monastic virtue of humility is, of course, chiefly emphasized. Salimbene had gone up to Tarascon in Provence to meet the General on his return from a long tour of inspection in England, France, and Spain. There one evening after compline at the Franciscan house the General went into the cloister to pray; but the visiting brothers were afraid to go to bed before their chief.

"So, seeing their trouble and hearing them muttering, since they wished to sleep and could not, for a light was shining where the beds were, I went to the General, because he was very close and intimate with me, being of the same city and related to relatives of mine. I found him in the cloister praying and said to him, 'Father, the visitors are worn out with the toil of the journey and would like to go to bed, but they are afraid to get into their beds until you shall first come to yours.' Then he said to me, 'Go, and tell them from me that they are to go to sleep with God's blessing.' And so I did, but I thought I ought to wait for the General, to show him to his bed. So when he came back from praying I said to him, 'Father, you are to sleep in this bed, which has been made ready for you.' And he said, 'That bed which you are showing me is fit for a pope to sleep in, but never shall Brother John of Parma lie in it.' And he lay down in the vacant bed which I was expecting

to have. I said to him, 'Father, may God forgive you for taking away the bed I was expecting to sleep in, because it was assigned to me.' And he said, 'My son, you are to sleep in that pontifical couch.' And when I, following his example, refused, he said, 'But it is my special wish and command that you lie there.' So I had to do as he ordered."

There follows a pretty little scene to illustrate the General's business capacity and fairness in making appointments to office. It so happened that an English friar, one Stephen, to whom John had promised a lectorship in Rome at his own request [*pro consolatione sua*], arrived in Tarascon just as messengers came from the brethren at Genoa asking the General to send them a good Lector. "Then the General, who knew how to dispatch business quickly, for he was a man of good counsel and always had ready a well-considered plan, said to Brother Stephen, 'Here is a letter in which the brethren of the Genoese house ask me to provide them with a good Lector, and if you would be willing to take the place I should be greatly pleased; and when I come there I will send you on to Rome.' Brother Stephen answered, 'I shall be willing and glad [*consolatorie*] to obey you.' And the General said, 'You will be blessed, my son, for you have made a good answer. You will go with these brethren, you and your comrade, and I will write to the Minister and the brethren there to accept you as well recommended.' And so it was done."

But however great his admiration for the General, Salimbene must have his little joke. His comrade, also a John or Littlejohn (Johanninus), and also of Parma, said one day to the General, "'Won't you help Brother Salimbene and me to win our halos?' The General turned to my comrade with a smiling face and said, 'How can I help you to a halo?' 'By giving us a license to preach,' answered Brother Littlejohn. Then Brother John, the General, said, 'Verily, if you were both my

own brothers, you should not have it except by the sword of an examination!' Then I answered and said to my comrade in the hearing of the General, 'Get out! get out! with your halos! I had my preacher's license a year ago from Pope Innocent IV at Lyons, and now do you suppose I would take it from Brother Littlejohn of St. Lazarus? It is enough for me to get it once from him who has the power to grant it.' And truly Brother John was called 'Master Littlejohn' when he was a teacher of logic in the world [*in seculo*]."

This gives Salimbene a start for a detailed sketch of the General's life, beginning when he was a poor boy brought up by an uncle in the monastery of St. Lazarus in Parma.

"He was of moderate stature, rather short than tall, with well-shaped limbs, well set up, sound, and with great endurance as well in walking as in study. His face was like that of an angel, friendly and always merry. He was generous, liberal, courteous, charitable, humble, gentle, kind, and patient, devoted to God, diligent in prayer, pious, benevolent, and compassionate. He celebrated Mass every day and with such devotion that all present felt a certain grace therefrom. He preached with such fervor, both to the clergy and to the brethren, that he moved many of his hearers to tears, as I have often seen myself. His speech was most eloquent, never hesitating. His learning was great, for he had been a teacher of grammar and of logic in the world, and as a Minorite he was a great theologian and disputant. When he passed through Rome the brethren had him preach or discuss before the Cardinals, and he was reputed by them as a great philosopher. He was a mirror and an example to all who looked upon him, for his whole life was full of honesty and holiness, and his conduct was perfect. He knew music well and sang well. Never have I seen such a rapid writer or so beautiful and accurate and readable a hand. His literary style was lofty and polished and extremely sententious when he so desired in his letters.

"He was the first General Minister who began to go about through the provinces of the Order. But when Brother Bonagratia [a successor of John] undertook to follow his example and visit the Order in this way, he could not endure the hard work and within four years fell sick and died. Brother John was also the first to issue

letters of reception to lay devotees, both men and women, into the benefits of the Order. And this is the form of the certificate which he gave them:

"'To our beloved in Christ, friends and devotees of the Lesser Brethren, Sir J. and the lady M., his wife, and A. their beloved daughter, John, General Minister and servant of the Order of the Lesser Brethren, health and everlasting peace in the Lord! Accepting with sincere affection your devotion to our Order, which I have learned from the pious report of the brethren, and desiring to make a salutary return for your love to us, I admit you to all the benefits of our prayers in life and in death, granting you by these presents full participation in all the blessings which the grace of our Saviour shall deign to bestow through our brethren wherever they may dwell throughout the earth.' And please to observe that he refused to give these certificates except upon the express request of persons known to be devoted to God and the Order and special benefactors of the same."

It seems as if Salimbene must have had some experience of the scandals which were sure to result from this trading in the divine favor thus inaugurated by his friend, and desired to guard him against suspicion.

The weak point in John of Parma appears to have been that he was what Salimbene calls "a very great Joachite," inclined, that is, to a vague mysticism and perfectionism which seemed dangerous to the organized church system. The result was that popes who had at first regarded him with the utmost favor began to suspect him as a fanatic. "Pope Nicholas III took him one day by the hand and led him familiarly about the palace saying to him, 'Since you are a man of prudent counsel, would it not be better for you and for your Order if you should stay here in Rome with us as a cardinal, rather than to follow the words of fools who speak prophecies out of their own hearts?' Brother John answered the pope and said, 'For your honors I care not at all . . . but as to giving good counsel, I tell you I could indeed give wholesome counsel if there were any to hear me; but at the court of Rome in these days, little is talked of but wars and

scandals, and nothing is said about the saving of souls.' Thereupon the pope groaned and said, 'We are so used to all this that we imagine that everything we do and say must be worth while.'"

Here our chronicler makes a skip of several years and goes on to say, "When I was living at Ravenna Brother Bartholomew said to me, 'I tell you, Brother Salimbene, Brother John of Parma made a great deal of trouble for himself and for his Order; because he was of such learning and holiness and of such exemplary life that he could have rebuked the Roman Curia and they would have listened to him. But when he followed the prophecies of fanatics he brought reproach upon himself and greatly injured his friends.' 'Well,' I said, 'it seems to me so too, and I am greatly grieved, for I was very fond of him indeed.' 'But you too were a Joachite,' said Brother Bartholomew. And I replied, 'That is true; but after Frederic died (1250), who was once emperor, and the year 1260 had passed, I gave up that doctrine completely and am disposed to believe nothing but what I see.'"

This extreme disobligingness of the Emperor Frederic in dying so many years before the date set for his exit by the prophecies of Joachim was only one of the grudges which Salimbene had laid up against him. A considerable portion of his narrative is devoted to a recital of Frederic's Italian campaigns, especially of those in which his native Parma played the central part. At the close of this narration he sums up the life and character of his subject under the scheme of twelve misfortunes and seven "curiosities" or "superstitions." It is characteristic of his method that when he comes to his tenth "misfortune" he calls it the last, but then, evidently later, felt it important to add two more, in order, as he naïvely says, "to make up the number twelve." Frederic's misfortunes, the loss of empire, the rebellions of his son

and his most trusted servants, the entire failure of his Italian policy, are all traced by Salimbene to his hostility to the Church. "His second misfortune was that he desired to trample the Church under his feet, so that the pope and the cardinals and all the rest of the clergy should be paupers and go afoot; and this he purposed, not out of zeal for religion, but because he was not a good Catholic, and because he was greedy and avaricious and wanted the wealth of the Church for himself and his children and to crush the power of the clergy, lest they rise up against him. And this his purpose he confided to his intimate councillors, through whom it afterward became known. But God did not permit that such things should be done to His own.

"His third misfortune was that he tried to subdue the Lombards, but could not, for when he had them on one side he lost them on the other. For they are a mighty subtle and slippery folk, saying one thing and doing another; as when you try to hold an eel or a lamprey tight in the hand, the harder you squeeze the faster he slips away."

Salimbene writes with especial joy of what he calls Frederic's "superstitions, curiosities, maledictions, unbeliefs, perversities, and abuses," all of which he says he has described in another chronicle unfortunately lost. All these categories may safely be reduced to the one idea of "eccentricities." To this Franciscan mind the greatest of moral aberrations was what we should call "originality," or, to come nearer to Salimbene's vocabulary, "curiosity." Out of such a quality was sure to come a search for novelty, and this—to us the indispensable motive toward all valuable activity—was to the thirteenth century churchman the inevitable starting-point for every kind of disturbance in the divinely ordered scheme of things. It was certainly a shade more than queer if the emperor did really cut off the thumb of his notary

because he wrote his name "Fredericus" instead of "Fridericus"; but our faith in Salimbene's accuracy is not strengthened when he dishes up again for Frederic the old story told by Herodotus of an Egyptian king who tried the experiment of segregating young children to see whether they would speak "Hebrew or Greek or Latin or Arabic or at any rate the tongue of their parents." Salimbene adds the detail that the children all died "because children cannot live without the hand-clapping and gestures and smiling faces and petting of their maids and nurses; whence the name *fascenine* is given to the songs a woman sings as she rocks a child to sleep."

Still more curious is the accusation that "when Frederic saw the Land of Promise which God so often praised, calling it a land flowing with milk and honey and excellent among all lands, he did not care for it, and said the God of the Jews could not have seen his country, the Terra di Lavoro, Calabria, and Sicily, or He would not so often have praised the land which He promised and gave to the Jews; like that clerk who spoke unseemly things against God, and straightway lightning from Heaven smote him and he fell dead."

"A sixth curiosity and superstition of Frederic was that he once gave two men a good dinner and then sent one to sleep and the other out hunting. Then at evening he had them both cut open in his presence to see which had the better digested his meal; and the doctors said he who had slept had made the better digestion." Precisely why Frederic should have shut a man up in a wine-cask till he died in order to prove that the soul dies with the body, one does not quite see; but Salimbene says he did this, and uses the tale to show that Frederic was an "Epicurean," who believed in eating and drinking, for tomorrow he would die. He accuses Frederic of hunting up all possible passages of Scripture to defend this view of life, and then piles up a mass of counter-quotations,

"which," he says, "all tend to destroy the credulity of Frederic and his wise men, who believed there is no life but the present, so that they might the more freely live in the wretchedness of fleshly lust."

Putting together all these criticisms of this extraordinary man we see that Salimbene's indictment really means that Frederic II was a person of keen and eager intellect, anxious to learn and fearless in his investigation into the facts of Nature—in short a modern man and therefore detestable to the mediaeval spirit of conformity and dread of the unknown.

I hope to have shown by these random selections what a wealth of material is offered in this new volume for a better understanding of that mysterious transitional age when the dark shadow of priestly domination was passing slowly from the mind of Europe, giving place to the gradual illumination of a new doctrine of life, whose central idea was the goodness of earth and of humanity because they were alike the creation of a God who was good. In their blinded way the earliest followers of the Franciscan ideal were making their contribution to this development. The value of Salimbene's comments is in showing to what grotesque misapplications this ideal, in itself essentially false, was sure to be subjected. His own experiences fall within the first two generations of the Mendicant experiment, precisely the time when the great opposition of the "spirituals" and the "conventuals" was shaping itself within the Franciscan Order. In the generation following him this antagonism was to break out into a furious struggle in which the supremacy of the papal system itself was put in jeopardy. The stammering apology of Salimbene is a direct prophecy of the crushing indictment of Ockham and Wycliffe.

REFLECTIONS OF RITUAL IN PAUL

BENJAMIN W. BACON

YALE UNIVERSITY

Alongside the doctrine that our Gospels, in their general structure as well as their individual anecdotes, reflect the beliefs and practice of the primitive brotherhoods which gave them currency, should stand (if the theory be valid) some corresponding reflection in the still older Pauline Epistles. Especially should we expect Baptism and the Eucharist to affect the mode of teaching.

Direct references are of course not wanting. Orderly observance of the Lord's Supper is one of the objects in view in the writing of First Corinthians. We take our own ritual from 1 Cor. 11 23–26. Rom. 6 3 f. expounds the significance of Baptism, not without clear implication that the Romans, though no converts of Paul, must have been taught a similar doctrine. Gal. 5 21 and 1 Cor. 15 1–11 refer respectively to primitive ethical teaching and to the outline of the apostolic preaching of the Resurrection. Besides these we have more indirect references to primitive doctrinal confessions in Rom. 10 9 f., 1 Cor. 8 4–6 and 12 3. These more or less conscious and intentional allusions have a certain analogy with those Gospel narratives, such as the Feeding of the Multitude, the Last Supper, Vigil in Gethsemane, Passion, and Resurrection, which have a recognized adaptation to known observances of the early church. How illuminating both to narrative and ritual the perception of this relation may become needs hardly to be mentioned.

But it is something more and different when the treatment of other subjects is affected, be it in the Gospels

or in Paul, by familiarity with the ritual. On the small scale we notice it in the Gospels, when Mk. 10 38 f. gives the saying of Jesus to the sons of Zebedee in the form: "Ye shall indeed drink my cup, and with the baptism wherewith I am baptized shall ye be baptized"; whereas Mt. 20 23 has only: "My cup ye shall indeed drink." We notice it similarly in Paul when in 1 Cor. 10 2–4 Israel is said to have been "baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat and drink the same spiritual drink." One may well ask whether the influence thus apparent has not gone deeper and affected the general structure of argument and story.

Baptism and the Lord's Supper seem in fact to constitute the two foci of gospel tradition. The Galilean Ministry is related as an account of how Jesus *when he was baptized* was endowed with all the powers of the Spirit of Adoption and how he thenceforth pursued his career full of "the word of wisdom and the word of power." One can hardly fail to see the parallel to the neophyte's experience in baptism and the accompanying endowment with "gifts of tongues" and "prophecy, miracles, helps, healings," and the rest. The Judaean Ministry simply prolongs backward the interpretation of the rite of *the Blood of the New Covenant.* It begins where Jesus, setting his face toward Jerusalem, reveals to the Twelve the doctrine of the Cross and Resurrection. Its few sporadic miracles are all symbolic. Its anecdotes all deal directly or indirectly with the single lesson: Die to live.

We may well imagine that the clustering of anecdotes and sayings from the story of Jesus' life about these two foci, so that each half of the gospel narrative has its appropriate beginning and ending, is partly owing to the fact that Baptism and the Lord's Supper would inevitably be the chief occasions for rehearsing the story.

Is there, then, any similar unconscious influence traceable in the general structure of the Pauline Epistles where these come nearest to the form of systematic expositions of Paul's "gospel"? Is there an analogous grouping in Romans and Ephesians, and perhaps Galatians as well, even if the Corinthian letters, and others whose specific occasion has determined the course of thought, show no such tendency? It will be well before attempting an answer to consider first what evidences appear even in First Corinthians, written in answer to a series of questions by Paul's correspondents, and apparently answering them *seriatim*, of incidental reflection of ritual. For besides the general features common to all the Epistles which adapt them to public reading in the churches—we mention only the closing Benediction (in 2 Cor. 13 13 Trinitarian in form) so closely analogous to the Benediction which it was the prerogative of the Levite (Num. 6 22–27) to pronounce in the synagogue at the close of the service—there are certain well known features of First Corinthians which almost certainly reflect the observances of Passover. The letter implies its composition at about this date (cf. 16 8), and as we know by abundant later testimony the celebration of the great Jewish Feast of Redemption did not cease in the Christian church. Its ritual continued with slight alteration, but with a spiritualization and enhancement of its meaning. Thus in 1 Cor. 5 7 f. we have allusion to the ceremony of Purging of Leaven, preparatory to Passover (or more strictly to Unleavened Bread, the seven-day feast of the new grain-harvest ushered in by Passover). The reflection of the ritual here is quite unmistakable. At midday of Nisan 13, a few hours before the slaughtering of the lambs, it was the duty of each Jewish householder, upon signal given by the priestly authorities, to inaugurate a formal search of the premises, removing every vestige of the leaven of the last year's use, that after

the seven days of unleavened bread (*mazzoth*) the new year might be begun with fresh leaven. We cannot, then, mistake the figure when Paul writes to the Corinthians: "Purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump of dough (φύραμα), even as ye are unleavened (ἄζυμοι); for our Passover, too, hath been slaughtered, even Christ. So then let us keep festival not with old leaven, nor with leaven of malice and wickedness, but with unleavened cakes (ἀζύμοις) of sincerity and truth." The reference here cannot indeed be properly called "aetiological," for Paul is not attempting to account for or support the Jewish rite; but his language is influenced by it to an extent which clearly proves that the Corinthians, Gentiles though they were, if not actually engaged in a ceremonial corresponding to the Jewish, were at least quite familiar with the Jewish ritual. And this inference is important, for, while the fact is not generally recognized, there is ample evidence that the allusions to the ceremonial of this two-fold feast—Passover-Unleavened Bread—extend all through the Epistle and should be decisive on vital points of interpretation.

The central feature of the Passover rites for Christian symbolism was of course the slaughter of the lamb in the evening of Nisan 14. The central feature of Unleavened Bread was the lifting up before God in the temple of the "wave-sheaf" of "First-fruits" on Nisan 16. By his resurrection on the third day (*i.e.* Nisan 16, the third day after the slaughter of the lambs) "Christ became," says Paul, "the First-fruits of them that slept." Indeed the ideas and symbolism of this Festival of the New Corn underlie the whole of his great chapter on the Resurrection Body (1 Cor. 15). In particular, he compares the death *and burial* of Jesus to the kernel of grain dropped into the soil seemingly to perish, but really to receive from God a new body (corresponding to the old) through the mighty working of the resurrection life.

Christ likewise, says the Apostle, "died for our sins according to the Scriptures *and was buried*, and was raised again the third day according to the Scriptures." This common gospel, preached alike by Paul and all other evangelists (ver. 11), is the starting point for an exposition of his doctrine of the resurrection body. There is indeed great dispute among commentators and critics as to what "Scripture" can be referred to in Paul's allusion to "the third day," seeing Hos. 6 2 is never so employed by early writers. But if we continue with his argument throughout the chapter, observing that his thesis in verse 20 is a comparison of the risen Christ to the "wave-sheaf" of new corn lifted up before God in the ceremony of "First-fruits" on Nisan 16, we shall see at least a correspondence with "the Scriptures" which prescribe the ritual of Passover and Unleavened Bread (Lev. 23 4–14). The ritual direction is that "on the morrow after the sabbath (*i.e.* after the first day of Unleavened Bread, "the fifteenth day of the same month," ver. 6) the priest shall wave the wave-sheaf before the Lord." Thereafter seven weeks are to be numbered until Pentecost, thus making an unbroken festival, the Feast of Weeks, whose observance, as we know, passed over from Judaism into the Christian church. "First-fruits" fell in the year of the crucifixion (Jn. 19 31), if not in every year, on "the first day of the week," which would be, "according to the Scriptures," the "third day" after the slaughtering of the Passover lamb. When, therefore, in 1 Cor. 5 7 Paul makes an equivalence between Jesus' violent death and the slaughter of the lamb on Nisan 14, and in 15 20 between his resurrection and the lifting up to God of the wave-sheaf of First-fruits ("Now is Christ risen from the dead and become the First-fruits of them that slept") on Nisan 16, it is not unreasonable to hold that the "Scripture" on which he professedly bases his calculation of days is that which prescribes the

calendar of the Feast of Weeks, enacting in particular that the ceremony of First-fruits shall take place "on the morrow after the sabbath," "the third day" from the Passover sacrifice. We may even be disposed to think also (though this would be mere conjecture) that the series of "manifestations" related in 1 Cor. 15 1–11 is in a sense a primitive *catechesis* of the Christian Feast of Weeks, the same Pentecostal period which is emphasized in the opening chapters of the Book of Acts.

But suppose that we have not found in Lev. 23 4–14 the true explanation of Paul's reference to Scripture as designating "the third day" as that of the resurrection. Still it remains highly significant that in 1 Cor. 15 20, 36–38, 42 ff. he reverts to the imagery of the current festal season, which he had already applied to the death of Jesus in 5 7, to interpret now Christ's resurrection also. Were it not for the parallel thus drawn between Christ's resurrection body and the wave-sheaf of first-fruits, we should be at a loss to understand the special mention of the *burial* of Jesus in 15 3; for the story of the sepulchre found empty (which was either unknown to Paul or else has been purposely ignored by him) plays no part whatever in his argument. No; his mention of the burial serves to complete the parallel with the *wheat sown in the ground* (ver. 35–38), for which God provides a new body "even as it pleased Him, and to each seed a body of its own." Realization of the allusion to the ceremonial of "First-fruits" makes the meaning clearer, just as is the case with the allusion to Purging of the House from Leaven in the chapter urging the Corinthian church to purify itself from immorality.

We are not yet at an end with the use of Passover themes in First Corinthians. When Paul would correct the abuses at Corinth in his converts' celebration of the Lord's Supper, he reminds them that by proper observance they "proclaim" (καταγγέλλετε) the Lord's

death. The term is indeed a suitable one to describe the ἱερὸς λόγος of the mysteries, the drama set forth in these mystical rites, but (what doubtless is much closer to the mind of Paul) it describes exactly that parallel feature of the ritual of Passover prescribed in Ex. 12 26 f., which makes the "proclaiming" of the story (the *haggada*) the most vital part of the whole.

Passover themes are again reflected in 1 Cor. 10 1–5; for the incidents of the flight from Egypt, passage through the Red Sea, feeding with manna, supplying with water from the rock, employed by Paul to set forth the Christian sacraments, are scenes from the Redemption story which Passover commemorates. Israel, when they passed from the bondage, the darkness and death of Egypt through the Red Sea, and were covered by the guiding cloud of the divine Presence as they journeyed under direction of Moses toward the Promised Land, "were baptized unto Moses in the sea and in the cloud." The manna which fed them and the water from the smitten rock prefigured the "spiritual meat and drink" of the Lord's Supper.

And Ephesians is almost equally rich in reflections of Passover themes. For Origen (to take but one example) is surely right in his exegesis of the difficult passage Eph. 6 15. This exhortation to "stand, having your loins girt, and your feet shod with the readiness (ἑτοιμασία) of the gospel of peace," is an allusion to the Vigil of Passover similar to that in 1 Thess. 5 4–10, in both cases mediated by the Passover imagery of Is. 59 16–20. For the law for the celebration of Passover (Ex. 12 11) prescribes that the feast shall be eaten "in haste," "with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, and your staff in your hand," ready to fare forth at the word of the "glad tidings of peace" and redemption. This, says Paul, should be the Christian's attitude in his vigil until the dawn of the Redemption morning. For vigil too

belongs to the ritual of Passover. "It is a night of vigil unto the Lord for bringing them out from the land of Egypt, a night of vigil unto the Lord to be observed of all the children of Israel in their generations" (Ex. 12 42).

We might well take note also, while considering these reflections of Passover ritual, that Eph. 1 3–14 is constructed on the rhythmic plan of one of those "spiritual songs and hymns" of the Redemption which are referred to in Eph. 5 19, and that one such has actually been quoted in 5 14.

Thus far we have confined ourselves to reflections of Jewish ritual, or adaptations of them in the Christian assemblies, in the hope that their obvious usefulness for the interpreter will stimulate effort to apply a similar method to the greater and more systematic Epistles with reference to the two distinctively Christian rites of Baptism and the Eucharist.

Romans, unlike First Corinthians and (perhaps) Ephesians, was not written at the very season of Passover. It shortly antedates the "days of Unleavened Bread" spent at Philippi (Acts 20 6). It shows no single trace of such allusions to Passover ritual as fill the chapters of First Corinthians and Ephesians—an argument from silence which lends no small support to our conclusions from those Epistles. On the other hand we do find evidences of something like that aggregation of the material which we have already observed in the Gospels in groups corresponding in significance to the two great sacraments of the Church.

If we look carefully at the outline of Paul's thought in both Galatians and Romans, the two Epistles in which he comes nearest to a systematic exposition of his "gospel," we shall see that it has (so to speak) a certain polarity, and that in both Epistles the two poles of the thought are the same. Indeed Galatians affords a

double illustration of the principle; for Gal. 2 15–21, which gives in retrospect Paul's defence of his principles against Peter before the assembled church in Antioch, is but a sketch in miniature of the fuller defence which occupies the rest of the Epistle. In the dialogue with Peter verses 15, 16 give Paul's doctrine of Justification by Faith. But how can we account for his boldly imputing this doctrine to Peter also, unless it rests back upon a teaching "received" at the very outset (1 Cor. 15 3), a common, fundamental "gospel of the blood of Christ"? Without this indeed the faith of Peter and the Galilean disciples could never have rallied from the shock of Calvary. And to what else than the "cup of the new covenant in the blood of Christ" will that primitive gospel have attached "how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures"?

In the remaining verses of the dialogue (17–21) Paul refutes those who draw the false inference that forgiveness through faith in the blood of Jesus leads to moral laxity. This brief refutation is developed later in the so-called "practical section" of the Epistle, beginning at 5 13; but both in the dialogue and the subsequent development the basis is Paul's doctrine of Life in the Spirit, which is always for Paul at least a doctrine associated with the rite of Baptism. The doctrine of Life in the Spirit is, in fact, like that of Justification in the blood of Christ, general and fundamental, a common doctrine of all Christians.

What is known as the "doctrinal section" of Galatians falls into two portions—an argument in 3 1–4 7, and a direct appeal to the readers to return to their former Christian standing, 4 8–5 12. With the latter we need not here concern ourselves, for its references are to matters of the experience of the Galatian churches. We are concerned with the argument in Gal. 3 1–4 7, which is a strict logical unit, proceeding from the single postu-

late, "This only would I know from you—received ye the Spirit . . . by the hearing of faith?" to the Q. E. D.: "Because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father. So that thou art no longer a bond-servant but a son; and if a son then an heir through God."

It hardly needs the close parallel in Rom. 8 15–17, 26 f. to prove that this allusion to the cry (in Aramaic) "Abba" is an allusion to the "tongues" which accompanied and were considered to demonstrate the gift of the Spirit at baptism. The inarticulate prayers and groanings spoken of in Romans and the involuntary cry "Abba," had followed immediately in Galatia at the acceptance of Paul's proclamation of his gospel. They had not tarried to manifest themselves after the Judaizers had begun to win converts to their pseudo-gospel of "works of law." The "gifts of the Spirit," so invariable an accompaniment of Baptism to the mind of the early church that when they failed to appear the rite was administered a second time (Acts 19 1–7), had been the seal of God's own approval upon Paul's work in Galatia, so that he can well afford to rest his whole case, as he says he will, on "this only." We are quite prepared, therefore, for the climax of the argument in 3 26 f.: "Ye are all sons of God, through faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ." The "rabbinic" argument based on the use of the singular "seed" (σπέρματι) in Gen. 12 3, anticipated in 3 16, is now drawn out in 3 27–29. We have here Paul's doctrine of Life in the Spirit already advanced in 2 19 f., developed on its mystical side (*unio mystica*).

What we are less prepared for, after the Apostle's undertaking to limit himself to "this only," is his interjection between the appeal to the gifts of the Spirit in 3 2–5 and the reference to Baptism with its accompanying phenomena in 3 26–4 7 of a long section beginning at

3 6 on the Covenant of Promise, central in which are verses 13–14: "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us . . . that upon the Gentiles might come the blessing of Abraham in Christ Jesus, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith."

The argument, of course, concerns the covenant to Abraham of the Messianic blessings. Against his Judaizing opponents, who contend that the later enactments of ritual observances through Abraham (Gen. 17 9–14) and Moses (Ex. 24 4–8) have equal standing with the original in Gen. 15 3–18, Paul maintains that the Covenant of Promise to Abraham "preached the gospel beforehand." The legal and ritual enactments merely prepared the way for the coming of the world-wide blessing.

There is in Gal. 3 6–26 no specific mention of the Eucharist; yet it is manifest that the whole question turns upon the significance of the death of Christ, just as it did in the dialogue with Peter (2 21). Paul seeks to impose a meaning upon the "cup of the new covenant in the blood of Christ" which his opponents will not admit. The dialogue (2 16 f.) implies that they recognized it as "unto remission of sins," but not as implying that justification was not *also* through the law.

It is not, then, a surprising familiarity with the Old Testament generally which is presupposed by Paul among his Galatian converts in the doctrinal section of his Epistle when he digresses at 3 6 to speak of the revelations to Abraham and Moses, but only a familiarity with those portions which have a bearing upon—we may even say, are presupposed by—the doctrine of the New Covenant in the blood of Christ, a doctrine indubitably current wherever the Eucharist was observed.

Thus the doctrinal section of Galatians has the same "polarity" as the Gospels, or as its own account of Paul's

dialogue with Peter. The author sets out to prove that the baptismal "gifts of the Spirit" are a divine endorsement of his gospel of Justification without works of law. But he does not seem able to reach it except by way of his Redemption doctrine, and an exhibition of the true relation between the Covenant of Promise to Abraham and the Covenant of the Blood of Jesus. And when he has finished with his teaching of Baptism on the mystical side, as a guarantee of unity in the all-pervading Spirit of Jesus, he still returns again, showing in his "practical section" (5 13–6 10) how Life in the Spirit supersedes the need of law.

If in so practical an Epistle as Galatians Paul's thought should seem to "polarize" about Baptism and the Eucharist, it should occasion no surprise that in so systematic a presentation as Romans, a statement of his gospel written to forestall misrepresentation among believers he has never seen, Paul should employ the same structure for his thought. Particularly we should expect to find it in those central chapters which form the substance of his defence. And we are not disappointed.

It is common to subdivide the argument of Rom. 3–8 under the two heads, Justification and Sanctification. But we may better express the fact, in terms borrowed directly from the text, if we describe these chapters as setting forth first Paul's Doctrine of Reconciliation (καταλλαγή), and second his Law of the Spirit of Life. Up to Rom. 5 11 Paul's subject is the Atonement. He is defending a doctrine of justification by faith in the blood of Christ as the true issue, and as the God-intended meaning of the Covenant with Abraham. From 5 12 to the end of chapter 8 we have a new subject. The theme has become the Regeneration of Man and the Creation by Indwelling Spirit. The Apostle is expounding a doctrine of the Restoration of All Things (ἀποκατάστασις παντῶν) in the freedom of the Sons of God, and defend-

ing it against the charge that it gives the rein to sin. The relation of Rom. 3 19–5 11 to Gal. 3 6–18 is universally acknowledged. But a relation scarcely less close will appear between Rom. 5 12–8 39 and Gal. 3 19–4 7 so soon as it is perceived that the basis of reasoning on both sides is a doctrine of Life in the Spirit, a doctrine which we have learned to recognize as the essence of Paul's "teaching of Baptisms."

With the ensuing chapters (Rom. 9–11), containing Paul's special apologetic on the relation of Jew and Gentile in the divine economy, we need not concern ourselves, nor with the practical application of the whole in chapters 12–15. We are concerned with his *Weltanschauung*, his survey of "the whole tenor of the Scriptures," as the author of the *Muratorianum* has phrased it, his scheme of redemption as exhibited in 1 18–8 39, more particularly in his "gospel," which centres on the themes of justification by the blood of Christ (5 9) and regeneration through the Spirit (6 10 f.).

Even without the express references to the justifying blood of Christ (3 25, 5 9) in the first of these divisions, followed by a direct appeal to the symbolism of Baptism in the second (6 3 f.), it would be manifest from the general course of thought that Eucharist and Baptism are the nuclei of the respective elements of Paul's gospel. But let us trace the progress of his logic.

The introductory argument in Rom. 1 18 to 3 20 may be designated Paul's *kerygma*. It has the elements of the conventional Stoic "diatribe," especially as we find the diatribe in its Hellenistic adaptation and in its ultimately Christian form. Norden in his *Agnostos Theos* has familiarized us with the literary type, though (as was natural) he has not traced its pedigree with equal clearness on the Hebrew side through Deutero-Isaiah and Wisdom of Solomon. Paul's moral survey first of the Gentile, then of the Jewish world, to the

utter condemnation of both, is made, as the Apostle himself declares (3 19 f.), "that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may be brought under the judgment of God: because by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight." All this, accordingly, is only preliminary. It introduces as a τριτὸν γένος "the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ," whose general propositions are thereupon stated in outline in 3 21–31. It is here, then, that Paul's "gospel" in the strictest sense begins.

The demonstration of a righteousness, or justification (δικαιοσύνη, δικαίωσις), by faith as a prerogative of the "weak" and "ungodly," "sinners" and "enemies of God," against those who seek it under the covenant of Abraham through "works of law" occupies the whole of chapter 4 and is concluded in 5 1–11. The triumphant close is this: "We also glory in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation" (καταλλαγήν). We easily recognize Paul's "message of reconciliation," as he terms it in 2 Cor. 5 19–21 "how that God did not reckon unto men their trespasses," but "made him who knew no sin to be sin on our behalf." There is no specific mention of the Eucharist, but the echoes in Rom. 4 25–5 9 of the Isaian passages on which the "received" doctrine was based that "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures" (1 Cor. 15 3) are the clearest of any in the Pauline writings. We call attention to the Isaian phrases παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα (4 25); δικαιωθέντες εἰρήνην ἔχωμεν (5 1); ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν . . . ὑπερ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανεν (5 6); δικαιωθέντες ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι (5 9), etc. From the reference to the covenant with Abraham "that he should be heir of the world" (4 13), and the phrase of 5 9 "justified in his blood," it becomes manifest that Paul is expounding the doctrine of the cup of the new covenant in Christ's blood, and the phraseology into which he falls is the Isaian, familiar

to the church in its sacrament of the blood shed "for many" for the remission of sins.

With Rom. 5 12 a new subject is reached—the reign of death, and its overthrow. It is no longer Abraham and his covenant who stands over against Christ as a type of those who should afterward, like Abraham, believe "in God that quickeneth the dead" (4 17 and 24). Now it is Adam and his "one trespass unto all men to condemnation," who is opposed to Christ and his "one act of righteousness unto all men unto justification of life" (5 18 f.).

Baptism is now explicitly brought in as the basis of the doctrine (6 3 f.), because as the vehicle of the infusion of the Spirit of Adoption it mediates the restoration from the death that "entered the world through sin." But after the development of his antithesis of the first and the second Adam, extending to the practical exhortation of 6 12–14 to "present your members as instruments of righteousness to God as alive from the dead," Paul turns to a rebuttal of the charge that the doctrine "not under law but under grace" incites to sin. The attempt involves the clear exposition from 6 15 to 7 25 of the nature of our "freedom" in Christ, and the function of the law as revealing the "law of sin in our members" working death, a fairly close and very illuminating parallel to Gal. 3 19–22. Thereafter follows the great hymn on the Redemption by the Spirit, first of man's own body, second of "the creation itself," into "the liberty of the glory of the children of God," a parallel to Gal. 4 1–7. Thus the Restoration of All Things (ἀποκατάστασις πάντων) through the indwelling Spirit (8 12–39) answers to the doom pronounced on the world when "through one man sin entered into the world and death through sin" (5 12). Thus beginning and end of the argument are bound together, making a unit of this whole section. Life in the Spirit is its theme.

We have no need further to point out that the starting point of this course of thought is the symbolism of Baptism as a "bath of regeneration" (λοῦτρον παλιγγενέσεως), wherein we are "buried with Christ into death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life" (Rom. 6 4). A doctrine of the regenerating Spirit *must* (for that age) revolve around Baptism; because it was in this rite that the neophyte became conscious of receiving the Spirit of Adoption and "the powers of the age to come."

If after Romans we turn to that other great general presentation of Paul's gospel, clearly designed for some group of Asiatic Christians not directly known to Paul in the flesh, though it has borne since an early period in the transmission of the text the title "To the Ephesians," we shall find that, while it resembles First Corinthians in its reflection of the ritual of Passover, it resembles still more closely Galatians and Romans in the "polarization" of its teaching about the symbolism of Supper and Baptism respectively.

In Ephesians the familiar Pauline argument for Justification by Faith has almost totally disappeared. Only lingering echoes remain in the interjected clauses of 2 5 and 8: "By grace have ye been saved." "By grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God; not of works, that no man should glory." With good reason does the polemic disappear. The battle along this line was already won. But the disappearance of the polemic is very far from altering the deeper channels of Paul's thought. It continues to move along the parallel lines of Redemption by the blood of Christ, and Life in the Spirit.

The main division of Ephesians, separating it into two approximately equal parts, is fixed by the author. With the elaborate doxology and Amen at the end of chap-

ter 3 he makes an unmistakable transition from religious faith to practical application. The Prayer which begins at 1 15 after the long and rhapsodical Thanksgiving (1 3–14) is resumed after repeated digressions (1 19b–2 22 and 3 1b–13) in 3 14–19. It is a prayer for the readers' enlightenment by a gift of Christian *gnosis*, so that they may appreciate the infinite and unique grandeur of the Christian calling and inheritance. The digressions serve the purpose of exposition, so that the whole development takes the place of the "doctrinal section" to which we are so accustomed in Paul. Indeed this merging of the Prayer for the readers into a doctrinal exposition is somewhat exceptional, having its nearest Pauline parallel in First Thessalonians. On the other hand, the anticipation of the general themes of the Epistle in the exalted lyric of the Thanksgiving (1 3–14) is characteristic. A pair of three-fold refrains ("to the praise of his glory," ver. 6, 12, 14, and "according to the good pleasure of his will," ver. 5, 9, 11) divides it into three strophes concerned respectively with (1) Foreordination unto adoption as sons in the Beloved (ver. 3–6); (2) Redemption through his blood, attested by the gift of *gnosis* (ver. 7–10); (3) Inheritance as the "own possession" of God (ver. 11–14). The Thanksgiving serves (as so often in Paul) as a general preface to introduce the principal theme of the Epistle—in this case the Inheritance laid up for the Christian "in the heavenlies" with Christ. It is doubtless chosen by opposition to the tendencies (so easily recognizable in the twin letter to the Colossians) to "a gratuitous self-humiliation and worship of angels," "according to the weak and beggarly Elements of the world" (στοιχεῖα τοῦ κοσμοῦ—mere stewards and governors temporarily appointed over the heir, according to Gal. 4 2 f., 8 f.). Appreciation of the power and riches of God in Christ the Heir as evinced in the Resurrection and Exaltation, is consequently the gift Paul entreats

for his readers. But before considering further his Prayer and its elaboration, we must turn to the second division, that of practical exhortation, covering chapters 4–6.

Nothing can exceed the clearness with which in Eph. 4 1–6 9 the course of thought ranges itself under the head of the Pauline teaching of Baptism, or Life in the Spirit. It might really serve as the model, or rather the theoretical basis, for all Paul's ethical exhortations, bringing out the very soul of his doctrine of the indwelling Spirit of God, given through Christ, as root and spring of all right conduct. Here it is developed first in the relation of the various members in the church to one another (4 1–16); of the individual to himself (17–24); of individuals to other individuals, in the brotherhood, in the outside world, and in the church-meeting (4 25–5 2, 3–14, 15–21). Next it is applied to the relations of social authority (ὑπόταξις) in the household, the Spirit by its nature of loving service transmuting "subjection" into mutuality, as between husbands and wives, parents and children, masters and slaves (5 22–6 9). The Epistle ends with the exhortation already elucidated, to keep the vigil of the Lord's greater Passover (6 10–20), followed by Greetings (21 f.) and Benediction (23 f.).

It is only occasionally, as in 4 6 and 5 26, that Baptism is explicitly referred to in Ephesians. In a few other passages of this division the phraseology habitually associated with the rite is recognizable (4 30 "sealed in the Spirit"; "put off the old man . . . put on the new man," 4 22–24; "once darkness now light," 5 8); for Paul is concerned with the spiritual message of the rite, not its form. But if further evidence were needed that it is indeed the teaching of Baptism which underlies all this ethical application of the doctrine of Life in the Spirit, it might be drawn from the companion Epistle. Colossians, which has the same framework, and much

of the same phraseology as Ephesians, and which, on the assumption of authenticity for both, must have been written almost at the same sitting, begins the corresponding hortatory section:

> "Take heed . . . for in Christ dwelleth all the fulness (spiritual endowment) of the Godhead bodily, and in him ye are made full. . . . In whom ye were also circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands, in the 'putting off' of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ; having been 'buried with him in baptism,' wherein ye were also raised with him through faith in the working of God who raised him from the dead."[1]

Assuming that the proof is adequate that Eph. 4–6 is based on a doctrine of Baptism, we may return to the Prayer for the reader's enlightenment, which with its two digressions occupies Eph. 1 15 to 3 21. It is the first great digression in 1 19b–2 22 which particularly concerns us, the second (3 2–13) being a mere explanation and justification of Paul's application to himself of the title, "prisoner in behalf of you Gentiles." In the great digression after the mention of the manifestation of God's riches of grace and victorious power in the redemptive work of Christ it will not be hard to recognize that the course of thought is determined by a teaching of "the cup of the new covenant in the blood of Christ."

We have already noted that the shifting of the battle front has left behind the old war-cry of Justification by Faith; but the phrase "reconciliation" (ἀποκαταλλαγή) is still present (2 16), though changed in application. The "gospel of peace" preached to "them that are far off and them that are nigh" according to the word of Isaiah (Is. 52 7, 57 19), finds still, as in Rom. 5 1–11, its fulfilment "in the blood of Christ" (Eph. 2 13). Here is still the "reconciliation through the cross" as in the Justification paragraphs of the older Epistles.

[1] Col. 2 8–12; cf. v. 19, 3 1–3, 19 and the corresponding passages in Ephesians.

The mention of the exaltation of Christ to "the right hand of God," "far above all rule and authority and power and dominion, and every name that is named" (Eph. 1 19b–23; cf. Phil. 2 9–11), is just a signal for the launching forth in the whole second chapter upon a survey of the work of redemption filled with the phraseology belonging to the doctrine of the suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah, who "made peace by the blood of the cross."

Those who consider the Epistle deutero-Pauline may regard it as a further and serious objection to Pauline authorship that the "message of reconciliation" (here ἀποκαταλλαγή) is so different from that of the earlier and greater Epistles. The "gospel of peace" is not, as in Rom. 10 15 f., news of the reconciliation with God proclaimed by the heralds of the cross, but Christ's own proclamation, effected in the cross, of reconciliation between Jew and Gentile. By abolishing in his flesh the enmity, the law of commandments in ordinances, Christ made peace between circumcision and uncircumcision, and brake down the middle wall of partition (2 11–16). This is a decided change from Rom. 5 10, where sinful men are the "enemies" whom God reconciles to himself through the death of His Son. But, however we account for the difference, the parallelism is greater, and presupposes a common doctrine of the cross. The cross is in both (1) a demonstration of the great love wherewith God loved us even when we were dead through our trespasses (Eph. 2 4–7; cf. Rom. 5 8), and (2) an "abolition of enmity," a "reconciliation" which is not merely between Jew and Gentile but of "both in one body unto God" (Eph. 2 16; cf. Rom. 5 10).

This whole second chapter of Ephesians thus reveals itself as a parallel (whether Pauline or deutero-Pauline) to the "message of reconciliation" (καταλλαγή) which we have already recognized in Romans as a doctrine of the new covenant "in the blood of Christ." The

mention of "his flesh" and his "blood" (ver. 13, 15) is the more significant from the (somewhat incongruous) combination at the close (3 20–22) of the figure from the great Passover-psalm of the stone rejected by the builders but chosen by God to be the head of the corner (Ps. 118 22; cf. Is. 28 16), with the Isaian figure of the suffering Servant whose blood is made an atonement offering (Is. 52 15, 53 10–12).

The foregoing survey of the great Epistles in which Paul comes nearest to a systematic presentation of his "gospel"—Galatians, Romans, and Ephesians—may perhaps suffice to bear out the view that we have also in Paul traces of the same tendency observable in the structure of the Gospels, a tendency of the thought to "polarize" about the two great sacraments of the church. Paul's written "gospel" has the structural character we should look for if that oral gospel which he "received" (1 Cor. 15 1, 3) was already to some extent thus aggregated. It may be conceived as consisting of two elements: (1) A doctrine of the "justifying blood" of the new covenant, based on an identification of Jesus with the suffering Servant of Isaiah. (2) A "teaching of Baptisms," whose central thought was Life in the Spirit. What is obviously true on the small scale in 1 Cor. 10 1–4 would seem to be true on the larger scale in Paul's systematic presentations of his teaching. They do reflect the sacramental ritual of the primitive Church.

RECENT EXCAVATION AND EXPLORATION IN PALESTINE

GEORGE L. ROBINSON

McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago

Since the appearance of Professor David G. Lyon's article entitled "Recent Excavations in Palestine," which was published in the January number of *The Harvard Theological Review*, 1908, other ancient Biblical sites have been explored and many noteworthy discoveries have been made. And now that the work of excavation and exploration has been indefinitely arrested by the outbreak of war, it seems especially fitting that what has been accomplished during the past six or seven years should be collected and summarized.

In the article referred to, Professor Lyon gave an account of the explorations at Tell el-Ḥesy (ancient Lachish) in 1890–92; of the four *tells*—Zachariya, es-Safi, el-Judeideh, and Sandaḥannah—in the Shephelah in 1898–1900; of Gezer in 1902–1907; of Ta'anach in 1902–05; of Tell Muteṣellim (Megiddo) in 1903–05; of Tell Ḥum (Capernaum?) in 1905; and of certain valuable "finds" by the Arabs in the two Canaanite cemeteries at Samieh near Bethel in 1906–07.

Since 1907, when Professor Lyon wrote his article, among the new sites which have yielded gratifying results are Jericho, Samaria, Bethshemesh, Ophel, Mt. Zion, Balata (ancient Shechem?), and Carchemish, the great capital of the ancient Hittites. Besides these, here and there throughout the country many other discoveries have been made, notably the richly orna-

mented sarcophagus of Turmus 'Aya, numerous anthropoid sarcophagi at Sidon, the standard Jewish "Talent," and a full set of Hebrew wet and dry measures at Jerusalem; besides an exceptionally fine mosaic floor with numerous colored animal figures and various Greek inscriptions found near the crest of Mt. Nebo.

The principal explorers during recent years have as usual been the English, Germans, and French; but the Americans have also made a beginning. All excavation has of course been seriously interrupted by the war. The Palestine Exploration Fund had already left off actively excavating in 1912, long before there was any talk of war; in fact they ceased digging at Bethshemesh before their Field Secretary, Dr. Duncan Mackenzie, had satisfactorily completed his examination of that place. On the other hand, Captain Newcombe, representing the Fund, was busy during the winter of 1913–14 surveying the northern portion of the Sinai Peninsula. The Germans have continued their work at Balata, adding much new and valuable material to the history of Central Palestine, especially of ancient Shechem. For it should be remembered that even Central Palestine, the most familiar portion of the country to Bible students, which has been visited and revisited over and over again by tourists and to some extent scientifically explored, is still rich in archaeological treasures, which ought to be investigated and given to the world. Surely the discoveries of the past quarter of a century warrant the conclusion that even still greater "finds" await those who will devote themselves to the careful and thorough research of the Holy Land. And especially now does this hold good, inasmuch as the way is today more accurately and scientifically prepared for a correct interpretation of what is discovered. From the different types of pottery found to prevail in almost every *tell*, it is now comparatively easy to trace the successive civ-

ilizations that lie embedded in any given site. The chronology of pottery is on such a sound basis that "the dating of the various strata of a city has become," as Macalister says, "almost mechanical." Accordingly it is reasonable to hope that shortly it will be possible, from the accumulated materials obtained through excavation, to write a history of Palestine from the archaeological point of view. Great is the encouragement, therefore, to continue as soon as peace is re-established the work which has been so patiently, laboriously, and successfully begun.

Jericho

Between the years 1902 and 1909 Professor E. Sellin of Vienna dug over the hill of Jericho, and in 1913 he and Dr. Watzinger published an account of their excavations in a monograph entitled *Jericho, Die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen.* As is well known, the location of ancient Jericho was strategic. It lay on the caravan route from Gilead and Moab to Central Palestine. Both in war and peace it supplied the highlanders of Ephraim, Benjamin, and Judah with necessary food products. The *tell* itself is well fortified by nature, rising some forty feet above the level of the surrounding plain. In form it is an irregular egg-shaped mound, one thousand one hundred feet long by five hundred feet broad, having a total area of only about twelve acres. It was fortified in ancient times by a thick wall, whose foundations give evidence of great skill in construction. The height of its wall was sixteen feet and its length approximately half a mile. At the north end of the city the excavators found what they supposed are the foundations of an ancient citadel. Heavy walls twelve feet thick protected it before and behind. At each end of this citadel were massive towers. Another structure, possibly a watch-tower, stood close by. These were the two most important sub-

structures unearthed. No temple or sanctuary was laid bare, but the foundations of many dwellings were disclosed.

Archaeologically eight distinct strata were found to cover the mound, the chief of which are the following:

(1) The lowest of all, the prehistoric, probably Canaanitic. To this stratum, which represents the oldest culture, belong certain dwellings near the citadel, whose foundation walls are unmistakably ancient; the pottery, too, bearing all the marks of antique ware. The culture of this stratum is thought to be Canaanitic; for the remnants of this ancient period are found only in the strata which precede the destruction of the city, and cease suddenly, having no connection with the subsequent Israelite ware beginning from the ninth century B.C., when, as we know from the Old Testament, Hiel the Bethelite, in the reign of Ahab, rebuilt the city (1 Kings 16 34). Accordingly it is claimed that this gap, which is not found elsewhere in Palestine, shows that after the fall of Jericho, in about the thirteenth century B.C., the site was for a long time uninhabited, probably having been used for horticultural or agricultural purposes. Drs. Sellin and Watzinger lay great emphasis on this fact, thus accentuating the harmony between the Old Testament account of the history of Jericho and the verdict of archaeology.

(2) Above the Canaanitic deposits were found many evidences of Israelite culture. Houses of a distinct Hebrew type, built of burnt brick and having stairs of stone, were unearthed near the "fountain hill." Grey, yellow, red, and black pottery was found dating at the latest from the ninth century B.C. To this period are ascribed the foundations of more than thirty small dwellings closely crowded together, and having, what is very remarkable but not uncommon elsewhere, infant-jar burials beneath their floors. Some of these jars are evidently importations from Cyprus and Mycenae.

They are colored with white engobe or lilac-brown coating, which may carry them back to as early as the tenth or even the eleventh century B.C.

(3) Belonging to the late Jewish period were found sherds of black polished ware, of Attic type. Specimens of this kind were found especially numerous on the north side of the citadel. The excavators ascribe them to the fifth or possibly to the fourth century B.C. There were also discovered fragments in terra cotta of human and animal heads, jar-handles bearing Rhodian stamps, in some cases having Aramaic lettering upon them, notably the divine name Yah or Yahu—a distinct novelty in Palestinian archaeology.

(4) To the later Byzantine and Mohammedan periods certain sepulchres containing coins, vessels of glass and stone, clay lamps, knives and other objects of iron, were assigned; also wooden caskets and marble slabs, besides many other objects of lesser importance.

In the fourth chapter of their monograph the authors give a graphic summary of their discoveries, showing the bearing of them upon Israel's history. Pages 171–190 are particularly instructive. The authors freely allow on the basis of the excavations that the Biblical account in Joshua 6 of the taking of Jericho contains an essential kernel of history. The excavations show, they believe, that Jericho was first settled in the dim twilight of the fourth millennium B.C. The castle with its double wall having fallen, they conclude that the account in Joshua 2–7 is that of an actual event. The ceramics found point back to the first half of the second millennium B.C. While many Old Testament authorities hesitate to assign a date to the conquest of Jericho because of the allusions in certain Egyptian inscriptions to the Habiri, and especially because of the descriptions given in the Tell el-Amarna tablets of the conditions prevailing in Canaan at that time, Professor Sellin and Dr. Watzinger conclude with-

out hesitation that "Canaanitic Jericho was destroyed, at the latest, 1500 B.C.," and that for centuries thereafter the city was never rebuilt. In the period after the schism, however, new dwellings and other larger buildings were constructed and the city was inhabited till the downfall of Samaria (722 B.C.). But another long silence ensued shortly after this date, a silence which may have been due to Sennacherib's capture of it. In that case Jericho was probably one of the "forty-six walled towns and cities" which Sennacherib claims to have wrested from Hezekiah, king of Judah, in 701 B.C.

Samaria

During the three years, 1908–10, as the readers of this *Review* well know, Harvard University, under the direction of Drs. G. Schumacher and George A. Reisner, conducted extensive excavations at Samaria, one of the most important sites in all Palestine. For a detailed account of what was found, consult Professor Lyon's articles in *The Harvard Theological Review* for January, 1909, April, 1910, and January, 1911.

Between April and August of the first year, 1908, considerable remains were found: for example, a temple of vast proportions, belonging to the Graeco-Roman times, probably Herod's, which was unearthed on the north end of the hill, near the modern threshing floor; a marble statue of heroic size, thought to represent Augustus, on the summit of the hill; a large and well preserved Roman altar; besides the foundations of an immense temple, probably that mentioned by Josephus in his *Wars* (i, 21, 3), which Herod built in honor of Augustus and which Septimius Severus is reported to have repaired. Attached to this temple there was an immense stairway about eighty feet broad, furnishing an approach from the west to what must have been a stately edifice. More-

over, a great massive wall seems to have enclosed the entire temple precincts. This temple or palace, situated on the summit of the hill, was at one time unquestionably the dominant feature of the city.

In 1909 Dr. Reisner carried on most successfully what Dr. Schumacher had so auspiciously begun, discovering that the lower foundations of this presumably Herodian structure were of Hebrew origin, and probably belonged to the palace enclosure of Omri and Ahab. At the west end of the hill also he unearthed a large gateway flanked on either side by two large round towers, which were evidently Roman, resting upon two larger square towers respectively which were probably Greek, and these in turn built upon rock foundations which may well have been originally cut by the Hebrews. He also found at the extreme opposite end of the hill, near the threshing floor, at a point where the famous Street of Columns and the ancient Roman paved road terminated, a large basilica or court of law, which stood closely adjoining the forum of the Herodian city.

In 1910 the previous excavations of the site were carried to the mother-rock. The foundations of the temple on the summit of the hill were still more clearly investigated, and it was eventually found that the four diverse strata of débris on the surface of the *tell* represented four different periods of construction; and that the oldest belonged to the reigns of Omri, who bought the hill, of Ahab, who ruled from about 877 to 854 B.C., of Jehu, and of Jeroboam II. The date of the structure was obtained from an alabaster vase found in the ruins, which bore the name of Ahab's contemporary, Osorkon II of Egypt, who ruled from about 874 to 853 B.C. But the "find" of greatest significance was the *ostraka*, or inscribed potsherds, of which there were not less than seventy-five. In Egypt the *ostraka* which have been found are often inscribed with texts of the most varied

contents—business-letters and contracts, official documents and the like. Those discovered at Samaria seem to have been the inscriptions or labels of a wine shop, or of an oil magazine. For example, they tell about jars of "fine oil" and "old wine," and give in every case except two the date of the inscription or label, often with the owner's name attached, and specifications as to whence the oil or wine had come. Number 13 of the series, translated, reads as follows: "In the tenth year (presumably the tenth year of Ahab). From Abiezer. (Belonging) to Shemaryau. A jar of old wine for Asa. From the hill."

These *ostraka* are all written in the ancient Hebrew character, the same substantially as that in which the Moabite stone (c. 850 B.C.) and the Siloam inscription (c. 700 B.C.) and ancient Phoenician inscriptions are written. The script is a running cursive, written in ink and evidently inscribed with a reed pen. A point or short dash divides the words from one another. The Divine name Yahweh is uniformly spelled Yau. In general these *ostraka* are of special interest to the epigraphist and of immense value to archaeology.

Bethshemesh

The excavation of 'Ain Shems, Bethshemesh of the Old Testament, was begun April 6, 1911, by Dr. Duncan Mackenzie, the Field Secretary of the Palestine Exploration Fund, and continued with interruptions until December, 1912. Dr. Mackenzie gives a full account of his "finds" both in the *Quarterly Statement* for 1911–12 and in the *Annuals* of the Fund for the years 1911–13. The results of his investigations are also succinctly summarized by Dr. E. W. G. Masterman in the *Biblical World* for August, 1913 (pages 101–109). Bethshemesh archaeologically is regarded as a second Gezer on a small scale.

In the twenty or more feet of accumulated débris which covered the *tell*, Dr. Mackenzie found embedded not less than five periods of civilization, which he is able to trace with reasonable clearness. Belonging to the first, which he calls the Canaanitic period, he designates certain ancient tombs, having shafts but without doors; antique pottery of Egyptian and Cypriote design, such as water jars with vertical handles and rounded bottoms; and Egyptian vessels and scarabs of the 18th Egyptian dynasty. These furnish unmistakable proofs of Egyptian influence, and carry the date of Bethshemesh's civilization as far back as to about 2000 B.C.

To the second or Philistine period (c. 1300–1100 B.C.), which, judging by the thickness of the deposit, was by far the longest of the five periods, certain fragments of painted pottery were assigned. The colors of this pottery revealed a local imitation of Cretan and also of Philistine type. Terra cotta male and female figures were also found; but there were no traces in this stratum of Egyptian influence. The period was brought, it is supposed, to a sudden terminus by a tremendous conflagration, which left the south gate (thought to have been the only entrance to the city) buried beneath thick rubbish, which has prevented the doors being opened or closed ever since. From this it has been inferred that during the Philistine period the city was fortified, whereas during that of the Hebrews, which followed, it remained unwalled. The Hebrews generally are known to have rebuilt little of that which was destroyed by them in taking a city.

The third or Hebrew period, which extended from about 1100 to 700 B.C., is sharply differentiated from its predecessor by a layer of charcoal, which extended pretty generally over the whole site. This is supposed to have been due to the capture of the city by the Hebrews, who burned the ancient Philistine town. The pottery with

stamped handles belonged to this stratum, and bore unmistakable evidence that it was of Hebrew manufacture. On the other hand, none of it was painted or of definitely known Philistine make. During this period the city had no defence. And because in the region of the south gate a two-fold stratification of sun-dried deposits was found, it has been inferred by Dr. Mackenzie that the city must have been burned a second time, probably by Sennacherib and his army on their way to Lachish in 701 B.C. (2 Kings 18 13–17). Subsequent to this time the place seems to have been abandoned for perhaps 1000 years.

Abundant remains of the fourth or Byzantine period (300 to 600 A.D.) were found at the east end of the *tell*. Extensive ruins of a large Byzantine convent or monastery were laid bare. This structure is situated in the southeast corner of the city enclosure and upon the most lofty point of elevation. Its eastern wall seems to have rested on the thick, strong wall which surrounded the city. Dr. Mackenzie thinks this monastery was not yet completed when the city was taken by the Arabs.

To the period of the Arabs little of value is ascribed. The Arabs probably destroyed the monastery after driving out the inhabitants of the city. If they occupied the site at all, they probably rebuilt nothing, but merely lived upon its ruins a simple semi-nomadic village-life till perhaps about 1000 A.D.

The most important discovery made at Bethshemesh from the point of view of the religion and history of the place was the High Place Grotto Sepulchre. The Grotto, which immediately adjoins the sanctuary, runs back underneath the High Place, being approached by spiral steps. The relics found within it point to a time prior to the period of the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty. But this High Place Grotto was not the only instance of sepulture within the city area. There were several

others, some of which had long ago been transformed into cisterns or grain pits. The necropolis proper was situated outside the city wall on the north side. The tombs inside the walls are doubtless the more ancient. It was probably at the end of the first or Canaanitic period that the change from an unwalled to a walled city took place. Then it was that the High Place Grotto got covered up and forgotten, and henceforth the people of Bethshemesh began to bury their dead exclusively outside the city.

But the chief interest of all Dr. Mackenzie's discoveries centres in the High Place itself. While cutting a trench from north to south across the central area of the city, he found, as he tells us, toward the middle of the trench five pillars lying on their sides as though they had been knocked down, the one on the east side being broken in two as if it had been purposely smashed. These stones Dr. Mackenzie regards as the sacred pillars or *boetyls* of a high place, set up in veneration of the dead; the spirit of the departed being imagined by the ancients to take possession of his pillar on the performance of certain ceremonial and magic rites for that purpose. To the south of the high place an ancient well, over sixty feet deep, thought to belong to the Hebrew period, was found. One regrets that the resources of the Fund did not permit of a thorough investigation of the entire site.

Ophel

During the winter of 1913–14 the Hebrews, represented by Captain Weill, working under the general direction of M. Clermont-Ganneau, began a thorough and scientific investigation of the hill known as Ophel, which is situated just south of the temple area of Jerusalem. Their hope was to find, if possible, the ancient sepulchre of David. Several years ago they purchased a small strip of per-

haps one hundred yards square, extending across the knoll from the Kidron to the Tyropoeon and from above the Virgin's Fountain down almost to the Pool of Siloam. They were allowed to dig, of course, only within the boundaries of the section which they had purchased and now possessed. This circumstance restricted them to a comparatively narrow area and in several respects crippled their work, but enough was accomplished in the few months they were engaged in the task to warrant a brief reference here to the results of their investigation.

Among the objects and facts of interest brought to light by Captain Weill are the following:

(1) The existence of a small tower at the south end of the hill not far from the Pool of Siloam. It rests upon a rock foundation which has been artificially cut down twelve feet and has rounded corners. Only a few courses of ancient masonry remain on top of the rock *in situ*. The suggestion has been made that this may have been "the tower in Siloam" which fell, and which is mentioned in Luke 13 4, but there is no proof that it is. Extending from the tower northward there is a heavy double wall, the inner and narrower one being four feet thick, and the outer eight. These ramparts form, it is supposed, in part at least, the fortifications of the original city of David, the fortress which David wrested from the Jebusites.

Captain Weill described to the writer and his students of archaeology who accompanied him the fortifications of the ancient city thus: first, there was a tower low down near the bottom of the valley; then, an inner wall somewhat higher up; next, a second wall still more elevated; and finally, an inner double wall which was the wall of David. Between the two inner walls great quantities of human skeletons, skulls, and other bones were found lying buried in a heap. Dr. Weill thinks that here we have evidence that the city was once

besieged, and that the dead who were buried here fell probably when attempting to storm the fortress. He dates these skeletons back as far as 600 B.C.

(2) Certain caves and tombs have also been found; but no tomb has as yet been discovered so old as the time of David. One cavity, sarcophagus shaped, but very roughly hewn, is perhaps the oldest of all. Two unmistakable tomb chambers were unearthed higher up on the crest of the hill, and in about the centre of the section excavated. One cave, twelve feet long by six feet broad and six feet high, with an oval roof and walls plastered with cement to keep out the water, was found, which resembles the tombs of Sidon. Another was discovered which was thirty feet long, ten feet broad, and six feet high, of similar type. Doubtless many others exist or existed in this the obvious necropolis of the city. But they have been destroyed by the Romans who subsequently used the place as a quarry. Enough remains, however, to show how tomb-chambers were sometimes cut one above the other; the upper being probably the older of the two. Captain Weill would date the upper storeys from about 500 B.C. and the lower from about 400 B.C. These cave tombs have groove-cuttings in their rock walls to receive the arched roofs. Fourteen inches below these grooves the rock has been rubbed smooth and two horizontal black lines, three inches apart, are discernible on the walls, similar to those in Hezekiah's tunnel, pointing to a possible date for the cave tombs themselves as early as about 700 B.C. All were quite empty; no Hebrew inscriptions were found anywhere. The cuttings are rough and, accordingly, Captain Weill concludes that they are Jewish, but probably not earlier than 500 B.C. Close by these tombs there was a cemented cistern with a bath, which doubtless belongs to early Roman times. A Greek inscription in uncial characters but bearing no date, was

found, which stated that once a synagogue, a hospice, and a bath stood here, having been built for the accommodation of strangers. These are supposed by Captain Weill to date from the age of Hadrian.

(3) But by far the most interesting discovery in the whole site was a rock-hewn underground tunnel-aqueduct, which Captain Weill traced low down on the east side of the hill, running practically parallel to the Tunnel of Hezekiah. In general, both these underground aqueducts follow the same course and are independent of each other. The newly discovered one is considerably further to the east and lower down than the other, and is probably the older of the two. It apparently brought the waters of Gihon, or the Virgin's Fountain, down to the Lower Pool of Siloam, known to the Arabs as the Birket el-Ḥamra, or "The Red Pool," which was probably "the king's pool" of Nehemiah 2 14. We inspected with candles at least two hundred feet of this new tunnel discovered by Captain Weill, and are persuaded that it gives evidence of very great antiquity. In the judgment of Captain Weill it is quite probably several centuries older than the Tunnel of Hezekiah, having been abandoned when the latter was cut. At one point the tunnel was excessively narrow, but we managed to press our way through. A short distance below this narrow point there was left projecting from the rock a jutting undetached bar, apparently intended to be used in damming the water flow. Close by to the left of this jutting bar, an opening in the rock wall of the tunnel allowed the waters which were held back to flow out into the gardens of the valley immediately below.

Captain Weill spent four months in excavating this small belt of the Ophel Hill and practically completed the work of examining all that the Hebrews at present possess. They covet of course more surface to explore.

Perhaps after the war has terminated they may be able to secure a larger tract, and thus be allowed to continue their search for the tomb of the Patriarch David.

Mt. Zion

Across the Tyropoeon westward from Ophel rises the traditional Mt. Zion, which is a hill some two hundred feet higher than the eastern Ophel Hill. Here in recent years several new discoveries have been made by the Franciscans and the Fathers of the Assumption, who have been establishing themselves in Jerusalem for the last twenty-five years, chiefly in connection with the annual *Pèlerinages de Pénitence* from France. About twelve years ago the Franciscans purchased from the Armenians twenty acres of ground, which they have since slowly but persistently excavated. Streets, aqueducts, baths, halls paved with beautiful mosaics, and various other objects have been found.

But the most striking discovery made by the Franciscans is an altar or sanctuary, possibly an ancient Jebusite "high place." Father Barnabas Meistermann, author of a *New Guide to the Holy Land*, showed us it. It is situated low down in the earth, on the southern side of a cemetery enclosure, some nineteen and one-half feet below the surface of the accumulated débris which now covers the hill. The fact that it was found buried so deep beneath the rubbish does not of course militate against the supposition that it was once a sanctuary. When Dr. F. J. Bliss and Mr. Macalister excavated Tell es-Safi (Gath?) a few years ago, it will be remembered that they found what they called "a heathen high place" full twenty feet below the surface of the rubbish which covered that hill (cf. Bliss' *Development of Palestine Exploration*, page 280). Close by the supposed sanctuary on Mt. Zion there are unmistakable traces of an old

Roman pavement, also sunken, though not as deeply embedded in the accumulated rubbish of the centuries.

What really the Franciscans have here unearthed is difficult to say. The deep pit of the sanctuary which has been walled up and left open measures thirty-three feet long by twenty-four feet broad. At the bottom of the cavity, which is fully twenty feet deep, there are rock cuttings of peculiar interest. If they do not form part of a sanctuary, one is inclined to ask, what are they? There is first a large boulder of irregular shape, seven feet long by four feet broad; a rock-cut passage-way, with three steps two feet broad leading up to it from a rectangular court; the court itself rock-cut, thirteen feet long by eight feet, four inches broad; a reservoir or pool nine feet long by five feet broad; and other grooves and cavities of varying dimensions, some of them cut to receive water; besides niches and alcoves and other cuttings, all suggesting more or less definitely the idea of an ancient sanctuary. Dr. Dalman, however, dissents from this view of Father Barnabas, alleging that it was once an oil press and nothing more. But it is difficult to see in it a single mark pointing in this direction.

Father Barnabas' opinion is that it was once a sanctuary, quite possibly one of the sanctuaries of the ancient Jebusites, and that here on the south-west hill of their ancient city the Jebusites had their High Place of worship. This view is not impossible. For, while the Jebusites may have occupied the lower hill on the east, called Ophel, they almost certainly held in their possession also this higher south-west hill as well. Numerous cisterns, not fewer than thirty, cover the surface of this south-western hill outside the present city walls. Modern Jerusalemites insist still on calling this hill "Mount Zion." Perhaps, as Sir Charles Watson in his excellent little monograph entitled *The Story of Jerusalem* (1912)

points out, both hills were occupied by the Jebusites, the east hill having been allotted to Judah and the west hill to Benjamin (Joshua 15 and 18). The tribe of Judah took the east hill; but Benjamin was not able to take the west hill (Judges 1 8, 21). During the period of the Judges both hills fell back into the hands of the Jebusites. David made the east hill his residence. Joab later captured the west hill, and David made it the people's city. This assumes of course that Jerusalem was from the first a twin city; which fact, if true, would help to explain the dual form of its Hebrew name, *Yerushalayim*, or "two Jerusalems."

The Fathers of the Assumption also have recently (1912) made several noteworthy "finds" in their property, which joins hard upon that owned by the Franciscans. For example, on the eastern slopes of their portion of Mt. Zion, as one descends towards the Pool of Siloam, they have found the Prison of Peter, and the foundations of an ancient church built supposedly over the spot where the Apostle, after having denied his Lord, went out and wept bitterly. They have also unearthed an ancient oil press which is one of the best preserved and most noteworthy in all Palestine; and in their digging they have come upon elaborate Roman baths and residences, and many rock-cut chambers, vaults, cisterns or dungeons; but most important of all, a long, broad, and solid flight of steps running down from the summit of Mt. Zion some three hundred feet or more toward the Tyropoeon valley, reminding one of the stairs which in Nehemiah's time descended from the City of David (Nehemiah 12 37).

These same Fathers of the Assumption, about six years ago, in their excavations on Mt. Zion came upon a set of hollowed-out stones, which have proved to be the measures of capacity mentioned in the Bible. In the series discovered were included also a set of small

vessels containing one-tenth of almost all the liquid measures. Their discovery has been reported by Mr. J. E. Spafford of the American Colony, Jerusalem, and published in *The Journal of the British Archaeological Association* for December, 1912 (pages 220–223). A fuller account of their "finds" is given by Père Germer-Durand, in a lecture published with illustrations in a small volume entitled *Conférence de Saint-Étienne* (1909–10). Through this discovery of the Assumptionists, we are able for the first time to form some idea of what was simply guessed at formerly, and understand better than we ever did before the obscure and vexed question of Bible metrology.

Now from Ezekiel 45 11 we know that the Bath and Ephah were of the same capacity, and from Exodus 16 36 that an Omer is the tenth part of an Ephah. These passages warrant the inference that the metric system underlay the Hebrew metrology. By a comparison of what is taught on this subject by modern Jewish authorities, and these discoveries on Mt. Zion, the following table of Hebrew measures is deduced:

4 Logs make 1 Cab; 3 Cabs make 1 Hin; 2 Hins make 1 Seah; 3 Seahs make 1 Bath; 10 Baths, or Ephahs, make 1 Homer or Cor.

The Standard "Talent" of the Sanctuary

Another discovery of peculiarly interesting value is that made at Jerusalem in 1912 by the Algerian Fathers of the St. Anne Church and Seminary, namely, the standard *Talent* weight, which was kept in the sanctuary. It is on exhibition in the Museum of the White Fathers at the entrance to the Pool of Bethesda. Its appearance is that of a spherical stone, with flattened bottom, having a rude inscription at either end and weighing forty-two kilos or about nineteen pounds. Its weight accordingly

is about one-third greater than that of the talent of the Assyrians and Babylonians. This helps to explain the discrepancy between the Biblical account of Hezekiah's tribute to Sennacherib, "three hundred talents of silver" (2 Kings 18 14), and the "eight hundred talents" of which Sennacherib boasts in his *stele*, which is now in the British Museum.

During 1913–14 other minor excavations were made outside the Damascus Gate on the north side of the city, which revealed a depth of rubbish exceeding thirty-five feet; and also on the south side near the Dung Gate, where the Jews are building a new hospital. The latter definitely fixes the true course of the Roman Aqueduct which brought the water from Solomon's Pools across the Tyropoeon valley to the Temple area.

Balata (Shechem?)

Another site which has recently been excavated is Balata, a *tell* situated about a mile and a half east of Nablus, modern Shechem, and a few hundred yards west of the Well of Jacob. Here, according to early Christian tradition and the Samaritan Chronicle, stood the oak (*ballut*) of Shechem (Joshua 24 26; Judges 9 6). For two seasons Professor E. Sellin, formerly of Vienna, now of Kiel, has been investigating this place with extraordinary success. He was assisted during the winter of 1913–14 by Drs. Praeschniker and Grohmann, who were exceedingly courteous in showing us about the ruins.

The dimensions of the mound, according to Macalister, are three hundred and twenty-four paces in length from east to west and one hundred and twenty-eight in maximum breadth. In the absence of any evidence of other ancient settlements near to Jacob's Well, Macalister ventures to suggest that "this mound may be the actual site of the long lost Sychar" (*Quarterly Statement*, 1907,

pages 93–94). The Germans, however, believe that here they have discovered the true site of ancient Shechem. Their reasons for thinking so are as follows:

(1) The foundations of many ancient houses unearthed which seem to be Hebrew. These are very irregular and singularly compact, requiring great care to discriminate between the original Hebrew foundations and the more recent superstructures.

(2) A large fragment of the old city wall, several yards in length, very broad and deep, and built obliquely at an angle of about forty-five degrees. This wall is obviously of very ancient masonry; and not improbably, as the Germans suppose, dates back to the period of the Amorites.

(3) The ruins of a large palace, which also gives evidence of extreme antiquity.

(4) But most noteworthy of all, a great triple gateway which is the largest that has ever been unearthed in Palestine. It stands on the west side of the mound, being flanked by the immense fragments of the above-mentioned oblique and possibly Amoritic wall.

Much of the pottery found in the *tell* is also very old. Besides, not far to the east of the site there was recently discovered an Egyptian sarcophagus which is thought to have been that of Joseph. For, despite the claim of the Moslems in Hebron that the Patriarch was buried there, the most ancient tradition known declares he was buried "in Shechem, in the parcel of ground which Jacob bought of the sons of Hamor" (Joshua 24 32). This sarcophagus is now in the museum at Munich.

Carchemish

In 1911 the Trustees of the British Museum began to examine the mound known to the natives of North Syria as Jerablus. It is situated on the right bank of the

Euphrates about fifty miles north-east of Aleppo, and can now be reached by the Baghdad Railroad from the latter place. Jerablus is a *tell* fifty feet high and strongly fortified, having within its extensive wall-enclosure palaces, a citadel, and other public buildings. It is usually identified with Carchemish, the celebrated capital of the ancient Hittites. Already the sum of £10,000 has been expended in excavating the site, to which sum during the winter of 1914 a like amount was added to complete the task. Messrs. C. L. Woolley and T. E. Lawrence were in charge of the expedition during the year 1913–14. Dr. D. G. Hogarth has given a partial account of their discoveries in the *Illustrated London News* for January 24, 1914.

Three gates have been identified, one of which they call the Water Gate because it opens upon the Euphrates; another opening toward the north was just being excavated at the time of our visit in May, 1914; the third, which is perhaps the largest and most important of all, opens toward the south-west and is called by the excavators "The King's Gate." We approached the ruins by this south-west gate, which overlooks the plain on which Nebuchadnezzar checked the conquering career of Pharaoh Necho of Egypt (605 B.C.). On the inside of this gate once stood a palace, from whose jambs ran dadoes from five to six feet high, consisting of richly sculptured slabs of alternate black dolerite and white limestone (a style of architecture still imitated by the people of north Syria), on which were carved figures of bulls and horses and chariots, soldiers with armament like that which the Greeks derived from Asia Minor, officers marching to meet a royal group, a hunter-god, priestesses and acolytes bearing animals for sacrifice, a lion-headed sphinx with a tail ending in a bird's head, and other mythological figures, all in decidedly Hittite style. Concerning these carved figures Dr. Hogarth writes: "The style and execution of these reliefs upset all our

previous ideas about the quality of Hittite art; as do also the sculptures which lined the opposite side of the portal—royal ministers and servants, in whose delineation has been used a grace which is almost Greek." Close by this south-west entrance there was found the figure of a Carchemish deity, a bearded god of Assyria, again in genuine Hittite style, seated on a heavy base, supported by two lions, which in turn are led by an eagle-headed figure. This deity is regarded by Dr. Hogarth as belonging to the eighth century B.C.

Among other noteworthy "finds" should be mentioned four male heads, belonging to a broken dolerite relief, and ancient vases, dating back perhaps as far as 1500 to 2000 B.C. Everywhere Greek and Roman superstructures cover ancient Hittite remains. An immense stairway has been unearthed, running up the face of the Acropolis on the north. Built upon the terraced face of this Acropolis there once stood a palatial residence, having a shrine-like chamber and an elaborately inscribed portal. Before this portal stood a great laver, resting on two bulls. Numerous ruins were found on the apex of the Acropolis. The Romans once built a great temple here. Sargon II in 717 B.C. is known to have taken Carchemish and to have built a residence for one of his officers at the north end of the city. A series of magnificent tombs have likewise been brought to light on the Acropolis, in which were found pottery and implements of various sorts, and seals dating probably from the second millennium B.C. and following. Indeed the stratification of the débris at Jerablus gives, it is claimed, orderly evidence from the Neolithic age down to the close of the Bronze age. The development of Hittite plastic art also can now be studied from its cradle to its grave; likewise the hieroglyphic texts, of which more than one hundred new ones have come to light.

Summing up the discoveries at Carchemish, the most important is a long Hittite hieroglyphic text, guessed to belong to the ninth century B.C., which is declared by the discoverers to be the longest Hittite inscription as yet known. But unfortunately no one can read it. As Dr. Hogarth freely allows, "The Hittite script cannot yet be read by modern man." Messrs. Woolley and Lawrence are hoping to discover a bi-lingual key.

The view from Jerablus, looking east over the Euphrates into Mesopotamia, is extensive.

The Survey of the Negeb

During the opening months of 1914, the Palestine Exploration Fund through its Field Director, Captain Newcombe, was actively engaged "in connecting the Egyptian triangulation of the Sinai Peninsula with that of the earlier Palestine Survey." The task assigned him implied the mapping of the Ottoman Province of Gaza from Beersheba southward to Akaba and eastward to the Wady Araba; in other words, to prolong the first survey of Palestine to the Egyptian frontier. Messrs. Woolley and Lawrence, who were in charge of the British Museum's excavations at Carchemish, were invited to join the expedition and report upon any observations in the Negeb of strictly archaeological interest.

Reports of the Survey have been given by Mr. Woolley in the *Quarterly Statement* for April, 1914 (pages 58–66), and by Captain Newcombe in the issue of the same Journal for July, 1914 (pages 128–133); but a fuller archaeological and geographical report of what was really accomplished may be found in the recently published Double Number of the *Palestine Exploration Fund Annual* for 1914–15, entitled *The Wilderness of Zin.* In this more formidable and exhaustive report of their brief visit to the Negeb, the authors, Messrs. Woolley and

Lawrence, give an account of their route, the history of the district, the ancient caravan route from Hebron to Egypt, their reasons for identifying Kadesh-Barnea with 'Ain Kadees, together with an extended review of the Byzantine remains still found in the northern part of the district which they surveyed, and of the mediaeval remains near Akaba. They also supply a much-felt want in giving to the Biblical world two new maps of the district, compiled with the permission of the War Office from the survey materials.

Though the time spent in the undertaking was brief, the whole work was completed with the exception of a small area near Akaba, which the Turkish authorities were unwilling to have the English survey.

Discoveries by Natives

It remains only to mention two or three further discoveries made by the natives of Palestine in different parts of the country; their "finds" coming sooner or later, accidentally, to the notice of western archaeologists.

Early in 1913 the government authorities in Jerusalem received information that a richly carved marble sarcophagus had been found at Turmus 'Aya, near Shiloh. This little village is on the carriage-road from Jerusalem to Nablus, being about eighteen miles north of the Holy City. The name of the village has suggested a possible relationship between it and the Thormasia of the Talmud. It has not been identified, however, with any Biblical site. Mr. Jacob E. Spafford of the American Colony in Jerusalem contributes a description of its discovery to the *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* for June, 1913 (pages 115 ff.).

Two large sarcophagi were here unearthed, both however without any inscription to furnish a clew to their

origin. The larger of the two was cut out of white marble and left quite without ornamentation. It measured approximately eight feet in length by four in breadth, being carefully dressed on the outside surface, but somewhat carelessly and irregularly chiselled on the inside. Its lid was of the gable-shape type, found elsewhere in Palestine and Syria. For example, there is a remarkably ornate Roman sarcophagus lying exposed to the public about two miles out from Antioch in north Syria on the roadside between that city and Daphne. Its gable-roofed cover lies one hundred feet distant from the sarcophagus itself. Both are richly decorated with carved figures, heads, and garlands; but the lid is cruelly hacked by the vandals of the district, who have evidently tried to break it in two in order to transport it. Otherwise the sarcophagus is in a most perfect state of preservation, and should be protected from further possible and almost inevitable vandalism.

At Turmus 'Aya, the chief interest centres round a sarcophagus of similar design. Besides the plain one already mentioned, there was discovered another richly carved, also of white marble and ornamented with elaborate figures and designs. Its style points to the Greek period prior to the Roman occupation. It probably dates from the second century B.C. The art is admirable, though pronounced by specialists as inferior to that of the so-called tomb of Alexander found at Sidon, which is now in the Turkish Museum in Constantinople. Though it was mutilated and only large fragments still exist, still there were enough, together with the lid, to give some idea of its character and beauty. Male and female figures adorn it in bold relief; representations of Bacchus, of waves of the sea and boats, of horses and men and dragons, of fruits and flowers and cornucopias, cover its entire front. The symbolism of its carvings has been studied by a Frenchman, M. Michon, who has

found that they represent the four seasons, winter, spring, summer, and autumn, with figures of the earth and ocean.

Whose mausoleum it may have been in which these sarcophagi were found, it is difficult to say. But in view of the fact, as Mr. Spafford points out, that in this same neighborhood, not more than ten minutes from Turmus 'Aya, there are the ruins of an imposing temple, called Kefr Istuná, the artistic work on which resembles the unusual type on this sarcophagus, and inasmuch as the Elephantine papyri mention a certain Ishtuma as a resident at that time in Jerusalem, it is quite possible that this Ishtuma may have been the builder both of this noble temple and of this remarkably ornate mausoleum.

An Inscribed Mosaic near Mt. Nebo

Returning from Petra in March, 1914, the writer and his students from the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem visited Madeba and Mt. Nebo, and about one mile south of the summit of the latter, in a region called by the Arabs Ard el-Muḥeit, examined a newly found mosaic which an Arab peasant had shortly before discovered while building a house or barn for his grain. In constructing his granary the Arab had used the materials of an old chapel or church and had built upon its foundation. After completing his structure, when he began to level off the interior to make the floor he found a beautiful mosaic, one of the most beautiful in Palestine, which must have originally formed the floor of some church, possibly of a mortuary chapel.

It is thirty-six feet long by twenty-seven feet broad, being richly adorned in colors, with figures of animals and men, aquatic creatures, and quadrupeds of various kinds. The whole is in an excellent state of preservation. Along the borders of the mosaic work there are three Greek in-

scriptions which have been translated and published with notes by my student and friend, Mr. Willard H. Robinson Jr., B.D., in the *American Journal of Archaeology*, 1914 (pages 492–498). They date probably from about the fourth century A.D. The largest and most important of the three, which is inscribed in front of the altar, consists of six lines and tells of the prayers of certain devotees to the god of the "Holy Lot" and of the "Holy Procopias"—obviously the patron saints of the chapel.

The designation of Lot as a patron saint seems at first striking; but, as is known, an Armenian version of a Jerusalem ritual mentions that Abraham and Lot were both reverenced in Galilee in the seventh century; and the seventh and eleventh Suras of the Koran assert that "Lot was sent as a preacher to the people of the Five Cities to deter them from their vices." These views, therefore, as Mr. Joseph Offord suggests, "have probably been taken over by the prophet from some Moabite or Ammonite traditions, which were also familiar among the Madeba people at the period the newly found inscriptions were engraved, and later up to the Hegira" (*Quarterly Statement*, April, 1915, page 92).

A Visit to the Cave of Machpelah

We cannot close our survey of the archaeological conditions prevailing today in Palestine without an allusion to our visit to the interior of the mosque over the Cave of Machpelah in Hebron. It was on April 7, 1914, that the Hon. Henry Morgenthau, our United States Ambassador to Turkey, invited us to join his party. Non-Moslems are usually forbidden to enter this sacred place. The last Englishman to gain admission was Lord Northbrook, ex-Viceroy of India, in 1895; the last American, the Hon. James P. Angell, in 1898; and the last German, Prince Eitel Friedrich, in 1910. The

late King Edward VII as Prince of Wales, in 1862, and King George, also as Prince of Wales, in 1882, were among the few who were granted by the Sultan an entrance during the nineteenth century. Lord and Lady Bryce accompanied our party. A special *iradé*, or order from the Sultan, is necessary to enter. Unfortunately, the Moslems of Hebron are too bigoted to allow entrance to the cave itself. No one since Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela in 1163 A.D. has ever descended the twenty-four steps leading from the floor of the mosque to the bottom of the cave. So long as Moslems rule over Palestine, there is little hope of making a scientific investigation of this sacred enclosure. But while this special privilege may yet long be denied the archaeologist, there are other sites also most inviting, such as Kiriath-sepher, Gerar, Caesarea, and Machaerus, which may and ought to be explored.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE RELIGION OF THE HEBREWS. JOHN PUNNETT PETERS, Rector of St. Michael's Church, New York. Ginn & Co. 1914. $2.75.

THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL. HENRY PRESERVED SMITH, Union Theological Seminary. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1914. $2.50.

All history has to be rewritten from time to time; in the case of the Old Testament religion there is not only a constant accumulation of external material (pre-Israelite and other) and fresh exegetical results, but also new general views of history, broader conceptions of historical growth and historical unity, that is, of national life. The two volumes mentioned above pay due regard to all these considerations. They accept all the main conclusions of modern biblical criticism, and, though written independently of each other, are in substantial agreement as to the lines and the results of the religious development of Israel. The fact that the authors, members of two great orthodox Christian bodies, base their work on the conclusions of recent criticism, without question and without embarrassment, may help to remove or diminish the opposition to modern biblical criticism which still exists in some parts of this country.

The present Old Testament text, as our authors point out, contains material of various degrees of historical authority. There are contemporaneous documents (in histories, law-books, and the writings of prophets, psalmists, and sages); and there are parts that have been revised or rewritten by later scribes, the natural tendency being to import later ideas, ritual and Messianic, into earlier writings. Between original matter and additions the critic must discriminate by means of all the aids at his disposal, and he must not fail to recognize natural native development, when there is evidence for it, even when some outside influence is discernible or when some quite new conception seems to make its appearance. But, notwithstanding the varied character of Old Testament material, the text itself furnishes in the main the means of tracing an orderly growth of the old Hebrew thought. This is true particularly of the period after the time of David. The ground is less sure for the pre-Davidic period, and particularly for the beginnings. Both Peters and Smith recognize the meagreness of the records of the

most ancient time, as to the rôle, for example, to be assigned to Moses in the development. This, to be sure, is not a matter of fundamental importance—we are more concerned with the ethical and religious outcome of Hebrew life than with its starting-point. And it is doubtful whether the data at our command are sufficient to fix definitely the character and achievements of Moses. In regard to this there are two lines of tradition: one, the Judaean, says nothing about Moses as originator or introducer of the worship of Yahweh, speaking of it as practised by the patriarchs and as having begun in the time of a grandson of Adam; the other, the Northern or Israelite, represents Moses as having received the name Yahweh as a new name of Israel's god directly from the mouth of God. Recognizing this discrepancy in the two traditions, our authors agree, however, in regarding Moses as the real founder of the religion of Israel, and in some way connected with an initial ethical religious impulse. At the same time they hold that the Israelites, dwelling in the midst of the Midianites, absorbed or in some way adopted from them the cult of Yahweh. As to an ethical impulse at the beginning, there is no trace of ethical feeling in the Hebrew religion for more than two hundred years after the date usually assigned to Moses. On the other hand, the tradition from the ninth century and onwards persistently represents Moses as the founder of the national religion. The data have been treated in two ways: some scholars, relying on this later tradition, or insisting on the necessity for an individual founder (whose function was similar to that of Zoroaster or Jesus or Mohammed), regard Moses as a dominant religious personality; others, holding that he was a leader of some sort, yet find the general social conditions sufficient to account for the facts as we have them. It is the former of these views that is favored in the volumes under consideration, tentatively by Smith, decidedly by Peters.

The succeeding religious development is set forth in both volumes with fulness and clearness. The relation between popular opinion and the ideas of the religious leaders is kept constantly in mind—for example, the persistent polytheism of the masses down to a very late period, and the movement of prophets and sages through monolatry to a practical monotheism, which, however, permitted the recognition of the existence of other gods than Yahweh, but in actual life was not affected by this survival of the old beliefs. The effect of the growing sense of individual moral responsibility (a universal concomitant of moral growth) on the national religious life is clearly traced, and with it the development of the sense of sin which so

curiously combined spirituality with ancient physical conceptions. Israel's remarkable capacity of adaptation is pointed out. Whatever the social changes it experienced (sometimes apparently fatal), the nation was able not only to interpret them in accordance with the conviction of Yahweh's favor, but also to make them the occasion of a loftier view of the national mission in the world. The most striking illustration of this capacity is the treatment of the Servant of Yahweh in Deutero-Isaiah, regarded by both our authors as setting forth the future of the pious kernel of the nation, the true Israel, destined to be the teacher and savior of Israel and all other nations. The Messianic hope also (which illustrates the invincible reliance on Yahweh's saving guidance) is traced from its earliest appearance to the expectation of an individual saviour, generally a prince of the house of David, and finally, in the book of Enoch, to a supernatural pre-existent Man (the "Son of Man"), who is to crush all enemies and restore the ancient glories of the nation. It is properly pointed out that this hope was not destroyed by the growth of legalism; the devotion to the Law, nourished by the Synagogue, was, it is held, a quite natural and in many respects useful or necessary movement, accompanied by a keener sense of sin (which, however, was not wholly free from earlier low conceptions).

In both volumes the ethical growth of the nation is traced from the crude ideas and barbarous customs of the earliest times to the higher standards of the prophets, the legal literature, and the Wisdom books. The defect in the better moral thought, it is pointed out, is due to the self-complacent belief that Yahweh chose Israel out of all the nations and invested it with peculiar dignity and superiority to all the world, a belief from which followed a certain disregard of alien ideas and religious achievements. One would never learn from the Old Testament that Egypt, Persia, and Greece had produced anything in the sphere of religion that was valuable for the world. Yet, as is here pointed out, Israel did borrow or was influenced by outside ideas which it wove silently and skilfully into its own religious life. In the discussion of this department of religious thought, as in others, the moulding power of native external conditions and of psychical movements is recognized.

There is a noteworthy agreement in the two volumes in regard to critical questions such as the constitution and dates of various books—for example, Isaiah, Chronicles, and the Psalter. As is natural, there are different opinions among recent scholars as to the meaning of certain texts. The "Immanuel" of Isa. 7 14 is regarded by some as a designation of any child that should be born in the

immediate future, the "young woman" (not "virgin") being any Israelite mother, and the name signifying the presence and help of God; others regard the verse as belonging to the popular eschatology, a prediction of the coming deliverer; a third view, similar to the preceding, is that the young woman represents the nation, out of which shall arise the Saviour. Professor Smith prefers the first of these views, and Dr. Peters the third; yet the general conception of the development of Messianic thought is not affected by such exegetical differences. So there has been and is much discussion of Isa. 9 5 [6]; the passage is regarded by Smith as belonging to a later period, by Peters as Isaian. A whole literature has sprung up around the verse, into the discussion of which it is unnecessary to enter here, especially as the general sketch of Messianic thought is independent of the chronological and cultural considerations therein involved.

In both volumes the old-Hebrew idea of the future life is treated with caution and discrimination; in passages whose meaning is disputed the arguments on one side or the other are stated or indicated in such way that the reader can form his own opinion. This cautiousness regarding conclusions, a valuable quality, appears throughout the two histories. It is no easy thing to describe an ancient religion, particularly when the data are often meagre. But it may be said that, so far as the data go, Dr. Peters and Professor Smith have here given pictures of the religious life of ancient Israel that comply with all the demands of current historical science.

The proof-reading in these two volumes is admirable. Only one clerical error has been observed by the present reviewer: in Peters, p. 406, l. 8, instead of "second century of the Christian era," read "second century before the Christian era," or simply "second and first centuries B.C."

CRAWFORD H. TOY.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

REDEN UND AUFSÄTZE. HERMANN GUNKEL. Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht. Göttingen. 1913. Pp. viii, 192. 4.80*m.*, bound 5.60*m.*

Gunkel is known to many in this country by his *Legends of Genesis*, the English translation of the remarkable introduction to his epoch-making commentary on Genesis. In the present little book he has collected and edited eleven essays in order to give to a wider circle of readers some illustrations of the *religionsgeschichtliche* and of the *literaturgeschichtliche* study of the Old Testament, of which he is a leading exponent.

After presenting in the introductory chapter a character-sketch of Bernhard Stade, his famous predecessor at Giessen, Gunkel gives first two articles on "Aims and Methods of the Interpretation of the Old Testament" and "Fundamental Problems of the History of Israelitish Literature." These prepare the way for the treatment of Samson; Ruth; the Psalms; the Eschatological Hope of the Psalmists; Egyptian Parallels to the Old Testament; Egyptian Songs of Thanksgiving; Jensen's "Gilgamesch-Epos"; and the Odes of Solomon.

Specialists as well as others will be grateful for the collection in book form of these essays, which had appeared before in various, mostly popular, German magazines, not always easily accessible to us on this side of the Atlantic. For though the book is altogether popular, this does not mean that Gunkel has simply restated positions well known to scholars. There is always something new and fresh, and it is always presented in a graceful literary form. Old Testament scholars have all learned much from Gunkel's investigations in the history of religion in Israel and in the history of its literature. This suggestive and beautiful collection of addresses and essays is therefore sure of a cordial welcome.

Julius A. Bewer.

Union Theological Seminary.

The Gospel according to St. Mark. A. Plummer. Cambridge University Press. 1914.

The Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians. J. O. F. Murray. Cambridge University Press. 1914.

The Gospel according to St. Luke. W. F. Burnside. Cambridge University Press. 1913.

The first two of these three volumes are parts of the *Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges*, under the general editorship of R. St. John Parry. They are in some ways above the general standard of the series to which they belong; but it is impossible to extend a cordial welcome to either of them, because it is hard to see for what purpose they can properly be employed. The *Cambridge Greek Testament* is intended for the use of "schools and colleges," and all teachers would be most grateful for a series of commentaries on the New Testament which could be put into the hands of boys and young men at schools and colleges, and used as text-books for class work. What is required is a book which will make intelligible to its readers what the real problems are. It is not necessary that the writer should expound at great length his own or other

people's opinions as to the solution of these problems. It is of course desirable to indicate the various solutions which are offered by specialists, but the most important thing is to provide a clear statement of the problems. It is unfortunately characteristic of the recent numbers of the *Cambridge Greek Testament* that they, to a large extent, reverse this proceeding. There is no clear statement of the problems, but there is a great deal of purely partisan, though sometimes quite scholarly, exposition of some particular solution of the problems, and unduly extended treatment of some special point in which the writer is personally interested.

This is markedly the case in both the present volumes. In the commentary on the Gospel of Mark, Dr. Plummer deals at considerable length with many of the introductory questions. All that is known about Mark as a historic person is stated, and he gives a very good exposition of the evidence in Papias and elsewhere as to the writing of the Gospel. When he comes to deal with the question of the sources of the Gospel he discusses some of the more difficult points of the synoptic question, but never makes it plain what that question really is. He constantly speaks of Q in such a way that a school-boy will form the idea that the contents of Q are perfectly well known; but I do not think that any one will understand Dr. Plummer's general position unless he already knows so much about the question that he is not in the least likely to be using the *Cambridge Greek Testament* as a source of information. The treatment is moderately interesting to the trained scholar; but to him it falls short of conveying new knowledge, and to any one else it is obscure because it discusses problems which are never clearly formulated.

In the same way in the notes, though it is clear that the writer is constantly thinking of the eschatological question, it is never stated properly, and no sufficient help is given to the student who has heard of it but does not understand what it is. A similar complaint must also be made of the literature which is recommended. It is all chosen so as to recommend certain types of opinion, not to forward a thorough knowledge of the difficulties. All this is typical of the reason why the *Cambridge Greek Testament* is so unsatisfactory a series. It is written by scholars in a scholarly manner; but they only attempt to explain the difficulties of their subject so as to recommend the opinions which they think to be right, and the imposing discussions which take the place that ought to be filled by simple exposition are not really good enough to have any special value for advanced students.

Similar criticism is true of Dr. Murray's commentary on Ephesians. It is surely an abuse of opportunity that in dealing with the text of the Epistle there is no adequately clear statement of the principles followed by various critics, but a long dissertation somewhat in the style of Westcott and Hort on the question whether ℵ and B had a common original. It is the sort of essay which one would regard as meritorious, but rather wooden, in a student's dissertation for a degree; but it is absolutely out of place in an elementary commentary. It is also regrettable that the writer should have thought fit to inflict on us a long and somewhat acridly written refutation of Dr. Moffatt's treatment of the authenticity of the Epistle, instead of attempting to give a judicial account of the arguments which have led scholars to have doubts on the subject. It suggests that commentaries which ought to be valuable for the use of schools and colleges are being made the dumping-ground for semi-learned expositions of personal opinion, which under the appearance of fairness and moderation are really skilful statements of partisan positions, given an appearance of certainty either by silence as to the strength of other views, or by the selection from these of their weakest points as though they represented their whole case.

The third volume is an excellent book of a certain limited kind; it makes no pretence to being a work of original research, but claims merely to give a plain statement of facts and necessary explanations. Some of course will think that the standpoint is too conservative; but it is sensible and clear, and may well be recommended to schools in need of an orthodox but not controversial or reactionary book. The statement of the synoptic problem is the best elementary exposition which I have seen in a book of this kind.

Kirsopp Lake.

Harvard University.

The Eschatology of Jesus. H. Latimer Jackson, D.D. Macmillan & Co. 1913. Pp. 378. $1.50.

There is always a certain satisfaction in travelling with a well-informed guide, even though he be somewhat tedious with his information. Dr. Jackson wants to impress upon our minds that a familiar landscape is full of an interesting and significant species of growth, called Eschatology, which the casual traveller of the past either overlooked or ignored. To this end we are led through the Gospels, the Old Testament, and the Apocalyptic literature, in the first four chapters; then in successive chapters through a

consideration of Judaism "in the days of Jesus," a comparison of Jesus' thought with that of Judaism, a study of the Person of Jesus, concluding with chapters on "Husk and Kernel" and "Eschatological Survivals in the Creeds." Everywhere individual specimens, sometimes monotonously like other specimens, are held up to view with the specialist's interest in minor variations and new sub-species.

The tone of Dr. Jackson's book is too moderate and judicial to permit of its inclusion among the works of the "thorough-going" eschatologists. But he firmly and convincingly insists that Jesus shared the beliefs of his time, allotting to himself the rôle of "Messiah" in the drama of the Last Things. The Kingdom is future. Jesus is, at first, the Herald. "The feeling grows on him that He is something more, and by degrees He identifies Himself with the Kingdom which He has proclaimed and heralded. If it be still future, He Himself belongs to it already; where He is, there the Kingdom is in partial manifestation." "Throughout conscious of limitations, He, destined Messiah that He is, eagerly awaits emancipation; the supreme moment when He shall have passed through the gate of death to be exalted, as the Son of Man, at the right hand of God. That from thence He would shortly come, come in glory with the clouds of heaven, come to this earth, He is absolutely persuaded. At His coming the nations will be summoned to a dread tribunal, where He Himself, it may be, figures as the Judge" (pp. 110–111).

In spite of all this, the Messianism of Jesus is in sharp contrast to that of Judaism. Dr. Jackson centres the distinction on the element of suffering, which is obvious enough. He seems to feel, furthermore, that the unique consciousness of Jesus somehow transcended Jewish Messianism, quoting with apparent approval Bousset's description of the title as "a heavy burden which He bore in silence almost to the end of his life" (p. 311). As reluctant as the reviewer is to follow Schweitzer to the end, he finds no refuge in this position. The history of his people definitely gave certain categories of thought to Jesus. He might conceivably have thought of himself as a prophet, or as the Forerunner, or as Messiah; that he chose the last, carries its own significance. On Jewish soil, self-consciousness could have no form except in the given terms of thought. Messiahship, therefore, is not a reluctantly chosen mode of expression; it is itself, in this instance, the thought that we translate by the very modern and over-worked term, "self-consciousness."

It is to be regretted that Dr. Jackson did not find it possible to discuss Schweitzer's theories more directly. He tells us in the Preface that he declines "to go the lengths of Albert Schweitzer";

but nowhere in the course of the book does the reader feel that Dr. Jackson comes to real grips with the author of *Von Reimarus to Wrede*. If, as Dr. Jackson admits, the eschatological element in the life of Jesus is to be emphasized, what is the answer to Schweitzer's theory that the eschatological dogma dominated and determined every act of Jesus' ministry? By what defence would Dr. Jackson maintain his development theory, based apparently on Mark, in the face of Schweitzer's furious bayonet charge against all "psychologizing"? Is Schweitzer right in maintaining that Jesus endeavored to conceal his Messiahship to the end, and that he died because it was this secret which Judas betrayed? Was the ethic of Jesus as entirely "world-renouncing" as Schweitzer maintains? These and similar questions are in our minds because Schweitzer has forced them upon us. But Dr. Jackson goes his own scholarly way, arguing freely on almost every page with Burkitt, J. Weiss, Bousset, and a host of others, and leaves us to infer as best we may, with the help of not more than two or three inadequate foot-notes, what he thinks of Schweitzer and his theories.

Dr. Jackson's final word is an interesting one. He describes eschatology as the "husk." To find the "kernel" he does not fall back on the idea that Jesus was primarily the founder of an ethical Kingdom; he is content with the eschatological Jesus. In his own words: "Is it not true to say that the idea embodied in the eschatology of Jesus—the embodiment belonging to its own day—is that of the ultimate triumph of the cause of God? The idea is so grand that it cannot be other than divine. Because divine, therefore of abiding significance" (p. 350). It is a reassuring word, but not a final one. Much remains to be said about the eschatology of Jesus that Dr. Jackson has not said in this book.

Warner F. Gookin.

Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge.

The Miracles of the New Testament. The Moorhouse Lectures for 1914. A. C. Headlam, D.D. John Murray. 1914. Pp. xvi, 361. 6*s*.

Dr. Headlam has written an exceedingly clever book in defence of miracles, the chief distinction of which lies in its method of presenting the evidence. Accepting the two-source theory, the author examines separately the evidence of Mark and Q, then of Matthew and Luke in their present form, and finally of other portions of the New Testament. Since the sources preceded the Gospels as we have them, and since, as the author holds, Luke was written

by a travelling-companion of Paul, the evidence is carried back to a comparatively early date, and the traditional connection of Mark and Q with Peter and Matthew respectively warrants a plea for its first-hand character. Accordingly, the evidence is pronounced good: "That is to say, if the events recorded were not such as to cause us difficulties in accepting them, we should give them credence as we should other events recorded in history" (p. 300). Dr. Headlam has so keen a mind that, were he not a theologian, we should suspect him of having written that sentence with his tongue in his cheek. For certainly he cannot seriously mean that the character of events reported has nothing to do with their credibility. To put it concretely: if a witness relates that he saw a painter fall from a swinging platform when the rope broke, and we believe him, should we give equal credence if the same observer testified that he saw the painter rise to his staging without rope or ladder or any such help but solely by spiritual levitation, before he began work in the morning?

Furthermore, Dr. Headlam makes much of current criticisms upon uniformity and laws of nature, and particularly of Huxley's well-known statement, arguing that belief in uniformity is not of scientific origin at all but was born of an *a priori* thought of God. But he fails to discriminate between event as such, and the interpretation of event as miracle. A scientific man may, indeed, be reluctant to declare *a priori* that this or that particular event cannot have occurred substantially as related, but the interpretation of it as miracle is quite a different matter. He would undoubtedly argue that the occurrence, although appearing miraculous, was in reality no miracle at all, but was due to the presence of circumstances and the operation of forces not yet thoroughly comprehended; and this Dr. Headlam would seem to accept, holding that scientific progress has made miracles more credible by revealing hitherto undreamed-of possibilities of nature. That is to say, *x*-ray photography creates a presupposition in favor of the turning of water into wine, or the feeding of five thousand men besides women and children with five loaves and two fishes which multiplied in distribution. That indeed may be true in the case of an uneducated man, but is it really true of Dr. Headlam? Concerning the various attempts to explain the latter miracle, Dr. Headlam says that "again and again a strain is put upon our powers of belief by the attempt to explain away a straightforward and natural story" (p. 326)—and, of course, none by its acceptance. It is remarkable that this particular miracle for which there is the best evidence, so far as testimony goes, should be the very one which intrinsically is least credible.

Miracles are finally defined as follows: "A miracle means really the supremacy of the spiritual forces of the world to an extraordinarily marked degree over the mere material" (p. 335). But such a definition is open to many objections. Man has supremacy over the material forces of the world, but it has been won through knowledge of their laws and confidence in their uniformity. To plead that nature and its laws are but the expression of God's will, and that therefore whatever happens because of his will as direct and active cause must be congruous with nature and in accordance with its laws, suggests again the tongue in the cheek. Is it true that power over "demons" once, and similar power over the deranged now, should be deemed spiritual power, especially in view of Mt. 7 23 and 12 27?

One lays down a book like this in a mood of hopelessness, for it makes glaringly evident the difference between the clerical and the scientific habit of mind. Dr. Headlam solemnly takes his opponents to task for their mental bias against miracles without recognizing that he is correspondingly prepossessed in their favor by his belief in revelation and the Incarnation. In fact, freedom from mental bias is quite out of the question for anybody above the level of a blockhead. The only question is whether the bias inclines towards or away from the rights of the case, or, to be specific, whether the scientific, critical attitude towards marvellous events reported to have occurred in the world of space and time is more appropriate than the clerical and ecclesiastical. What, for instance, would a scientific student think of this sentence which closes the chapter on the Virgin Birth? "From the naturalistic point of view it is really one of the least difficult of miracles; from the Christian point of view it is one of the most beautiful. It has been one of the greatest inspirations of Christian art, one of the purest influences on Christian life. The Church has *therefore* wisely retained it in its creed" (p. 299). The italics are mine.

W. W. Fenn.

Harvard University.

Light from the East; Studies in Japanese Confucianism. Robert Cornell Armstrong, Ph.D. (University of Toronto Studies in Philosophy). Published by the Librarian. 1914. Pp. xvi, 326. $1.50.

This book deals with a subject which deserves the attention of the world's thinkers and scholars, but which has hitherto been almost entirely neglected. This fact alone furnishes a strong reason for gratitude to the present book. The author tells us that the motive

which induced him to take up this subject was a desire to understand the Japanese through acquaintance with the sources of their moral training and ethical thought. This admirable intention of the author, added to the intrinsic interest—and, it is fair to say, the difficulty—of the subject, gives the work every claim to our respect.

There is perhaps no need of saying what an important rôle Confucianism played in moulding the moral life and ideas of the peoples of the Far East. Its founder, or rather systematizer, Confucius, was a practical thinker and powerful teacher—I do not wholly agree with the impression given by Dr. Armstrong that Confucius had almost nothing of metaphysics. The ethical teachings of Confucianism had two characteristics: one being the close connection of ethics with the cosmological theories of the Chinese, which leads to emphasizing the ultimate unity of human life with the "way of Heaven"; and the other the union of ethics and politics, the result of which is shown in the prominence given to civic virtues. In the course of time the Confucian system of ethics was developed in various ways, the most significant being that a certain discontinuity existing between its metaphysics, or cosmology, and its practical ethics was filled up by psychological theories. This was done chiefly by the Confucianists of the twelfth century, under the reign of the glorious Sung dynasty. The aim of these psychological studies was to furnish material for a mental discipline, through which the "cosmic reason" was brought closer to human life and metaphysical truths were incorporated in morality.

It was this modified Confucianism that was adopted by the Dictatorial government of Japan established early in the seventeenth century, and that was destined to rule the moral life of the Samurai, the rulers and fighters. This authorized system of Confucian ethics was based on the teachings of Chu-hi, known in Japan as Shu-shi. The system of Shu-shi is eminent in its emphasis on the virtue of obedience; its philosophy is a statical view of the world, and its moral teachings easily ran to an extreme of inactive sobriety, and even to something verging on hypocrisy. Naturally this system served well the purpose of the government to keep peace and order, but it did not equally satisfy those active minds which demanded initiative and originality. Some of those discontented souls derived inspiration from Wan-Yangming (known as Wō-Yōmei in Japan), an idealistic philosopher of the sixteenth century. His view was dynamic and his method intuitive, and his followers in Japan propounded a system of idealistic thought, and practised its

ethics in a vigorous life of activity made possible by invigorating mental exercises in spiritual introspection. Besides this school of Yōmei, there were various thinkers advocating principles at variance with the static ideas and quietistic influence of the orthodox Shu-shi school.

The interests of these thinkers and their points of view are manifold; their theories, metaphysical, psychological, and ethical, are important; their personalities and lives are in some cases highly interesting. These matters are treated at length in the volume before us. But there is another point of no less importance and scientific interest; namely, the influence of the time upon the thinkers, and the reaction, on the part of some of them, against the stagnant conservatism of the peaceful centuries in which they lived. This is the sociological point of view concerning these Japanese Confucianists, and it is essential to take it into account in considering their teachings and lives. I cannot enter into discussion of these aspects of the problem, but I say this because the present volume singularly misses this vital consideration. These Confucianists wrote in various styles, both in Chinese and Japanese; and to overcome the linguistic difficulties alone is a great task. Moreover, the conceptions in philosophy, psychology, and ethics which are expressed in their writings are often very different from Western conceptions, and in many cases not sharply defined. Intellectual ideas are associated with emotional terms, ethical reflections are connected with the social and political conditions of the time. Full recognition must be accorded to the author's attempt to master these conceptions, but it remains a question whether he has really mastered them. In fact, there are not a few cases, as we shall see presently, in which he has not been cautious enough in identifying Western conceptions with Confucian terms. Yet such is the difficulty of pioneer work in this untrodden field of research, that credit must be given to the author for the measure of success he has achieved.

An examination of the book shows that the main part of it, Parts II–IV, is a translation in abstract of the three books by Professor Inouye, which the author cites among his authorities on page xii, and to which he acknowledges his indebtedness in occasional passages. I compared the text throughout, and was able to identify the whole main part with its sources almost page by page. The author cites Professor Inouye's opinions in a few passages, referring to him by name; but almost everywhere else the opinions expressed, as well as quotations from the original authors, are Inouye's. The author faithfully follows Inouye, even in citing the Upanishads

side by side with the Johannine Gospel, in analogy to Tōju's ideas (p. 136). On the other hand, the author reproduces passages, greatly abridging the original. On page 148, for instance, the author cites Banzan's views on Christianity; and there he omits the last part of Banzan's opinion which says: "In case the true Confucianism shall decline and Buddhism be vanquished, the country will be conquered by the 'Kirishitans' (Christians). Then both Shinto and Confucianism will be broken down and the people will become beasts and the Imperial Throne will be destroyed" (Inouye, *Yōmei Gakuha*, p. 237). Omitting, or overlooking, this passage, the meaning of which is clear, the author interprets Banzan as if he had appreciated the superiority of Christianity, and (contrasting this with an unfavorable judgment of Christianity by the same Banzan) says: "But later he seems to have learned more about Christianity" (p. 148). This is one of the instances in which Dr. Armstrong has misinterpreted his texts by abridging them in a way not just to the originals.

The author's treatment of his sources places the reviewer in a very peculiar and puzzling position, as to which—Inouye's original or Armstrong's reproduction—should be the object of this review. The original author, Inouye, is responsible for the general arrangement and the materials selected; but the author of the present book is responsible for the condensed translation and for the expression of certain opinions concerning the Japanese Confucianists. I cannot review the book otherwise than by taking both things into account and quoting Professor Inouye's three volumes as the "original."

Taking this stand, the first point is, Why did not Dr. Armstrong so rearrange the original as to give a general view of the whole subject and adapt it to Western readers? Inouye's original presupposes knowledge, on the part of Japanese readers, of Confucian ethics at large, of the special points in Shu-shi and Ō-Yōmei, and of the general social conditions of the times. But when the matter is reproduced for English readers, the author cannot start with such presuppositions; and ought, therefore, to have treated the subject with a definite perspective. He should have brought the important figures into greater prominence than is done in the original, and have omitted many minor details and persons. To take one instance, the original gives the villages where the philosophers were born, or the amount of rice they received as emoluments from their feudal lords. These particulars may be interesting to Japanese readers, but of what concern are they to Western readers? Things

essential and characteristic should be mentioned, which serve to illustrate the personalities of those Confucianists; but the author rather confuses the impression by reproducing in minute dependence on the originals these and other insignificant details. More important, however, is the fact that the author follows the originals in copious quotations—though much abridged—which are full of repetitions. The result is that the main threads are often lost, at least to the sight of Western readers. I wish that the author had been at pains so to remodel the original that the sayings of the leaders should have been quoted in full—of course in an elucidating manner—and some minor figures and the repetitions omitted. In this way, and in this way alone, perspective and coherence could have been kept, for the sake of Western readers, for whom a clear perspective is infinitely more needed than for Japanese readers. In short, the author has not been judicious in selecting his materials, nor sufficiently careful in quoting the original sayings.

So far concerning the external form. When we come to the contents of the work, we notice a grave defect in the author's treatment; viz., that he has not observed a proper proportion between the metaphysical theories and their consequences or supplements. The author pays much attention to the metaphysical or cosmological theories of *Li* (*Ri*) and *Ch'i* (*Ki*), etc., but peculiarly neglects the psychological theories, and their relations to the mental culture or spiritual exercise which was regarded as the essential condition of ethical training in all these schools of Japanese Confucianism. Not only as regards Japanese Confucianists, but concerning Shu-shi himself, the author fails to notice their psychology, as is especially evident in his concluding chapter (pp. 299–306). This defect has an important bearing, because it was in this point that Shu-shi and other Chinese philosophers were influenced by Buddhism, and here also that Japanese Confucianism developed a characteristic trait of its ethics in uniting moral life with spiritual exercise. Of course, this cannot be overlooked; but the author touches only slightly on this vital point, and evidently does not sufficiently recognize the importance of this feature in the later Confucianists.

The neglect of this point may be illustrated by several instances. Not only the men of the Yōmei school but of the Shu-shi school also laid so much emphasis on mental training that they can hardly be understood without paying full attention to what they termed "*kufū*" (Chin., *kung-fū*), "method of drill," or "*sonyō*" (Chin., *ts'un-yang*), "the preservation and perpetuation (of the primeval vitality)." Our author in treating the ethics of a Shushist (p. 82)

simply omits his theory of the "*sonyō*," which is found in Inouye's *Shushi Gakuha* (pp. 254–259), and jumps at once, between lines 8 and 9, from the theory of benevolence to that of death. In fact, page 82 of the book is a reproduction of pp. 253–261 of Inouye's original, except the omission above mentioned. Now this omission may be attributed to the author's judgment, but the grave defect of thereby missing a very important point cannot be overlooked. This is an illustration of the fact that the author fails to see in the psychology of later Confucianists a vital link connecting their metaphysics and ethics.

This brings me to a more serious remark; viz., that the author has thereby fallen into a point of view almost contrary to the purpose of his studies. The reader is told that the work was undertaken with the aim of understanding the Japanese, and the author's sympathetic attitude is to be appreciated. In spite of this, he says in his conclusion (p. 295): "The moral ideal of Confucianism is good, so far as the letter of it is concerned. It is an excellent moral code in ink. Its weakness lies in its spirit. . . . They [moral systems of similar types] fail to inspire and to give life." Thus the author has seen metaphysical theories and moral codes, but has failed to see how those Confucianists cultivated their psychological theories not only in thought but in life, in "*kufū*," the vitalizing principle and method of Confucian ethics. What the author accuses Confucianism of is rather a defect of his own observation than of Confucian ethics.

The author's criticism of Confucian ethics is that it lacks inspiring power. There is a question which he should have put to himself before coming to this conclusion, even apart from the consideration of self-culture practised by Confucians. The question which will arise in the mind of every careful reader is this: Were all these teachers mere teachers of letters, or did they exercise any amount of actual influence on the moral life of the times? The author tells us much of the lives and theories of these teachers, and has added to Inouye's originals three chapters of general remarks on the nature of these schools. But the reader is left almost entirely without information as to what these thinkers had to do with the people or with the training of the Samurai class. Of course, the author mentions, for instance, that Kaibara wrote his works in popular style, or that Tōju influenced his villagers very deeply; but unfortunately his interests are directed chiefly to the theories and sayings of these teachers, and little is said of their educative methods and their concern with moral training. And yet the author's conclusion is

that Confucian ethics is merely a moral code in ink! In any case, the "Light from the East," as presented by the author, seems to be a reflection of a light, and not the light itself. Had not the light some warmth and life? The reader will not be satisfied with the author's summary conclusion, but will demand an answer to the question.

Omitting various other points in the author's treatment of the subject that might be discussed, let us see some of his renderings of Japanese expressions into English. To begin with single phrases: the author uses various terms for one and the same expression. The most significant is the word for "*shin*" or "*kokoro,*" a term used by the followers of Shu-shi in a special sense. The author's renderings are, "mind," "heart," "soul." Had the author any definite intention in using these synonyms? "Reverence," "respect," "piety," "modesty"—these stand for "*kei.*" "Living reason," "the principle of production," "the principle of life," "living principle," "the principles (of heaven and earth)," "the actuative (!) law"—these are used for one and the same word, "*seiri,*" on pages 80–81 and 93–94 alone. Synonyms are useful for the sake of rhetoric, but it is rather puzzling to render a definite philosophical term by such a variety within so narrow a limit of space.

Some of the quotations are abbreviated too much or in a way not clear. On page 89 it is said: "They [the scholars of the classical school] uphold the way but reject reason." This is hardly intelligible, unless some explanation were added or a reference made to the point treated on pages 228–229. On page 50 the author, in speaking about a difference between Razan, who thought somewhat like Yōmei, and Fujiwara Seika, says: "Yōmei emphasized intuitive knowledge, . . . and hoped . . . to reach the intuitive knowledge by which he hoped to reach the 'Holy Place.' Fujiwara thinks the word 'Seiki' differs from the one used by Shu-shi, meaning original reason (*Kyū-Ri*), but that the thought is the same." This is a repetition of a passage quoted on page 41 (Inouye's original, page 28) and it will be very hard to grasp the meaning without reference to that passage or without an explanation. Let me add an explanation. The point is this: Yōmei aimed at realizing man's original nature by intuitive knowledge or spiritual introspection; and he deemed this attainment to be the realization of the "*sei-iki,*" which meant "to be within the threshold of the sage's ideal perfection." Now Fujiwara Seika thought that this ideal aim of Yōmei differed but in name from Shu-shi's ideal perfection. The latter taught that the perfection was attainable by "*kyū-ri,*" i.e. in "exhausting the source

of the universal reason," which is the original nature of mankind. I wonder whether the meaning is conveyed in the author's quotation. To take another, lighter one: on page 51 there is a quotation from Razan: "Man is originally a moving animal; how can he resemble a dead body?" This translation is quite right, but would it not be more intelligible to say, for instance: "Man is endowed with life, this is his original nature; how can he behave like a dead body (as recommended by Taoism)?"

The author discusses some points of Confucian ethics and its difference from Buddhism, but I confess that many of these discussions are quite beyond my grasp. Take, for instance, what he has to say on Jinsai's theories of the way and virtues on pages 231–234, which are identical in outlines with pages 233–244 of Inouye's *Shushi Gakuha*. The author quotes Inouye's interpretation of Jinsai as if it were Jinsai's own words (p. 231, lines 10–33), and uses the same word, "nature," for that by which Jinsai meant metaphysical essence and which he opposed, and for what Inouye employed in the usual sense of the word. Even apart from a confusion of this kind, the whole discussion is rather confusing than elucidating. The point seems to me not so complicated as the author makes it, but to amount to the difference between a metaphysical interpretation of the moral nature of man and an ethico-psychological view of moral virtues.

Let me add another passage on what the author calls Oriental pantheism. Since I am at a loss to grasp the meaning, I simply quote the passage (p. 126). It reads: "Yōmei's system, like most pantheistic systems, does not logically provide for evil. In so far as he makes evil separate from the original form, his system ends in a dualism, although he would not admit it. . . . This is the case with all Eastern pantheism. It is not true pantheism, since it ends in a dualism (?). So Western theism, whether of the Jew or of the Greek, is not true monotheism, since it ends in dualism—God *versus* the Universe. These two points of view are complementary. The East needs the West; the West needs the East. There can be no real pantheism which makes individuality an illusion. If so, we should be explaining the pantheism by the illusion. True pantheism is true monotheism. It provides for personality and individual responsibility."

The author devotes an appendix to Buddhism. Instead of taking up various points therein brought out, which are very disputable, I shall only quote his remarks on the conception of the Dharmakāya of Buddha (p. 318). He says: "In process of time, through the

influence of the Upanishads, and especially through the Yoga philosophy, this reverenced law became practically identified with the impersonal deity of Brahminism." I wish that the author would one day present the evidence for this bold assertion.

Lastly, in minor details the author leaves on me an impression that he left his manuscripts for publication in the hands of those who had no knowledge of the subject. Many names are spelled wrongly; in some cases Chinese names are written separating the family and the personal names, and in others united; one and the same book is cited under different names, such as "a classic on history" and "Shosho" for the same Shū-king; I-king is cited as "a classic on Philosophy"; the mythological portion of the *Chronicles of Japan* is cited as "a book written in ancient times"; the "Gozan," the "Five Great Monasteries," is cited as if it were one temple, etc. There are some startling novelties; for example, that "Japan had conquered the Loo-Choo Islands [in the sixth century!]" (p. 17); "Fujiwara Takechimaro became professor of the university in 704" (p. 19); "the word heaven [in Chinese] is a development from the original teaching about God" (p. 36); "the influence of Buddhism on this teaching becomes very clear if we substitute the 'world of illusion' for 'Ki,' and the word 'spiritual body of Buddha or law' for 'Ri'" (p. 38); "in the beginning of the ninth century, after the Chinese had driven out their enemies, there was a very strong patriotic feeling" (p. 301).

In conclusion, the painstaking labor of the author must be highly respected. But a little more care would have made the book a really valuable contribution to the world. Especially to be desired are perspective and coherence in general and careful investigation of historical data in detail. The volume is of a kind to which good indexes are indispensable; the index (pp. 325–326) is useless.

M. Anesaki.

University of Tokyo, Japan.

The Place of the Church in Evolution. John Mason Tyler. The Houghton Mifflin Co. 1914. Pp. xiv, 202. $1.10.

Professor Tyler offers some wise and generous reflections, chiefly applicable to laymen, but serviceable to the ministry as well. He presents a clear and hopeful outline of evolutionary processes which lead up to personality as the "clearest and fullest expression of the power behind and in civilization." The church is the body through which the divine life is to express itself by degrees more completely,

and its business is to aim at social amelioration in many forms, through the use of the diversity of gifts within it, and even more, to aim at "a higher and better personality." It is to be a centre of contagion—the contagion of goodness—and men who desire to do God's will should be welcome in it, though they may differ in the details of their formal confessions of faith. To remain outside is to miss the encouragement and knowledge that life needs in order to be adequate for its spiritual tasks. Within the church the disciple is in an organization that may be likened, historically, to a ship beating against the wind, but one that gains upon her havens in the end.

There is nothing startlingly new in the book, but its frequent sententious passages are reassuring to faith, and to some they may be even more.

George T. Smart.

Newton Highlands.

The Theology of the Church of England. F. W. Worsley. E. P. Dutton & Co. 1913. Pp. viii, 259. $2.25.

This is a very poor book. Such a dogmatic statement needs some proof, even although it seems a pity to waste space to prove what almost a glance would make evident. The book claims to deal with "The Theology of the Church of England." Yet it is only a commentary on the Thirty-nine Articles, together with a few remarks on the Prayer Book. Not a word about Hooker or Jewel or Chillingworth or Laud or Taylor or Tillotson!

Even within its scope the book fails in scholarship and in fairness. As to scholarship, the author, after mentioning the "thirteen articles" drawn up at a conference of Lutheran and Anglican divines, together with some other early documents, says, "None of the above had any real influence on the Articles as we have them." Yet the effect which these thirteen articles had on the Thirty-nine can be seen by a glance at the former as given in Hardwick's *History of the Articles of Religion.* And Gibson says of them in his book on the Articles: "Their importance, however, historically, is very great, for they form the link between the Confession of Augsburg and our own Articles. A comparison of the three documents makes it perfectly clear that it was only through the medium of the Book of the Thirteen Articles that the Lutheran formulary influenced the Forty-two Articles of 1553, from which our own are descended."

As to fairness, the following quotation will suffice. Mr. Worsley says in his preface: "Another leader, Dr. Hastings Rashdall, writes

as follows: 'Men will not go to church to hear views about the damnation of heretics, about the Fall, about the Atonement, about Absolution and the Sacraments which they have ceased to believe.' One is inclined to think that when people have ceased to believe in the Atonement and the Sacraments, it is about time that they ceased going to church." Now it is perfectly clear that, in the quotation from Dr. Rashdall, the word "which" does not refer to "the Atonement" and "Sacraments," but to "views" about the Atonement and Sacraments, which views they have ceased to believe.

It is hoped that these remarks and quotations will sufficiently justify the opening sentence of this review.

Edward S. Drown.

Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge.

The Life of St. Severinus, by Eugippius. George W. Robinson. Translated into English for the first time, with notes. Harvard University Press. 1914.

The Life of St. Severinus of Noricum possesses great importance through the fact that it is one of very few sources dealing with the downfall of Roman government and culture in the Pannonias at the time of the Gothic and Germanic invasions. It gives a vivid picture not only of imperial disintegration, but of the rise of the Church to semi-political authority, and its inner life during days of Arian and barbarian domination. Severinus acquired, as an ascetic of unusual austerity, wide political prestige; kings and queens came penitently to his cell; Odoacer elicited his prophecies of good omen.

It is gratifying that the first appearance of this classic Life in English should be effected so meritoriously. Hitherto we have had to depend on Migne, or Rodenberg in the "*Geschichtschreiber*" series, or Mommsen in the bulky *Scriptores*. A mutilated version of the Life was included by Baring-Gould in his collection of the Saints; but no recommendable English version has hitherto been given us.

Now, however, we have in Mr. Robinson's work an admirable translation, thoroughly annotated. But one detail of translation is open to criticism: we regret to find such a Latinism as "vicinage" (p. 53). The notes, particularly those relating to questions of historical interest, are meticulously full, and the instruction they give us original and trustworthy (for instances: that on the exhortation to Queen Gisa, chapter 40, page 95; on the status of the Rugii, chap-

ter 5, page 40; on the difference between "*ostiarius*" and "*custos*," chapter 10, page 51). Mr. Robinson's strictures upon the airy surmises and baseless additions of former editors are often amusingly adroit; but could not the same joust be made against our editor's flat assertion of "*pleurisy*" as the proper translation of "a pain in his side" (page 90)? All in all, however, the editorial work has been done with the most scholarly exactness and a fertility of inquisitiveness.

For the student of political and cultural history the work is of course particularly valuable. The same cannot fail to be true with regard to the student of church history. But would it have been outside the purpose of Mr. Robinson's work to include notes on the literary relations of Eugippius' production? To be sure, we are given some very illuminating references to parallel miracles in the Lives of St. Martin, Alneus, Antony, and Paphnutius; but these single instances scarcely make up the deficit of a thorough critique of the Life as a specimen of hagiography. This realm Mr. Robinson enters but does not invade. A glance at Pope Gregory's *De Miraculis* or at Günter's *Legenden Studien* convinces us that a rich possibility has been overlooked; a possibility verified by Tamassia's brilliant critique of the Legends of St. Francis, and by Zoepf's on the legends of the saints of the tenth century.

Charles H. Lyttle.

Second Unitarian Church, Brooklyn.

John Calvin: His Life, Letters, and Work. Hugh Y. Reyburn, B.D., Kirkintilloch. Hodder & Stoughton. 1914. Pp. viii, 371. $2.50.

In presence of the immense amount of source-material and the flood of books and articles since the quater-centenary of 1909, one wonders on taking up a new life of Calvin whether to admire the courage of the biographer or to view askance his temerity. The reformers were such indefatigable workers and their voluminous writings were so well preserved that many a modern scholar has had to give up the ghost before mastering the works of even one man. The Strassburg editors of Calvin's works—Baum, Cunitz, and Reuss —one by one passed off the stage, leaving the completion of the work to their followers. One of these died before the task was done; while the other—Erichson—pathetically wrote his "*absolvebam*" at the end of the last of the fifty-nine quarto volumes, twenty-seven years after his "*vénérées maîtres*" had begun the publication, and only a few months before his own death. The year of the comple-

tion of the *Calvini Opera* saw also the death of the Swiss scholar Herminjard, whose monumental *Correspondance des Réformateurs dans les Pays de Langue Française* had in its nine volumes come down only to 1544. The Old Catholic Kampschulte died, leaving to his friend Cornelius his remarkable study unfinished. Cornelius, likewise falling under the spell of the Genevan archives, devoted himself to first-hand investigation before he should complete Kampschulte, and he too found life too short and left both his own work unfinished and Kampschulte's second volume to be published by Goetz. One is sometimes tempted to wonder whether, with the possible exception of some proof-reader, the number of persons who have actually read Calvin's works entire would exceed the number of righteous men in Sodom. One hopes that Professor Doumergue of Montauban will live to do it, and to complete, indefatigable and devoted as his hero, the fifth and, if necessary, a sixth volume to round out the nearly 3,000 large quarto pages he has already given us in his scholarly biography of Calvin.

Remembering then the appalling amount of material, one is inclined to make some allowances for the lacunae and errors in the disappointing bibliography of this recent Scotch biographer. There is no mention in the bibliography or foot-notes of a single work in German. So far as one may judge, the book is based upon Calvin's Latin and French works and modern French and English writers, with no use of such German authors as Stähelin, Kampschulte, Cornelius, Lang. The author seems not to have known of the fourth volume of Doumergue, published in 1910. Had he done so, he might have utilized more of the over 150 books and articles there listed as published, 1908–10, in connection with the celebration of the four-hundredth anniversary of Calvin's birth. On the other hand, it should be said at once that Mr. Reyburn gives constant proof of faithful and intelligent use of his *Calvini Opera* and his Herminjard *Correspondance*, and, with the limitations as to range of materials, has produced a well conceived, well written, forceful, and fair-minded presentation of Calvin's life.

The book is interesting, and will stand with that of Professor Walker of Yale as one of the most readable and thoughtful biographies of Calvin in any language. It is far better than the slight and rather negligible French sketch of Bossert (1906); and, on the whole, a more satisfactory treatment of Calvin's life and activities than Lang's scholarly sketch (1909), or the rhapsodical Life by the Dutchman Penning; though Lang's monographs show a keener critical knowledge than Reyburn's biography. It may well be read

by many who could not find time or inclination to go through the monumental work of Doumergue. The most natural comparison is with Walker. Clearly Reyburn has not mastered, as Walker has, the German and monographic literature of his subject, and he would not be resorted to by the scholar who wished to know the most recent, critical, and trustworthy conclusions as to much discussed questions. There is nothing comparable with the minutely critical study by Walker (some of which evidently was done in proof after publication of monographs unavailable when the book was first written) on the date of Calvin's conversion—a discussion noted with appreciation by German scholars. On the other hand, Reyburn gives about a fifth more matter than there is in the brief life by Walker; and, in spite of limitations as to German and other recent critical work, the Scotchman evidently understands his man and gives us a first-rate story, that moves along and shows keen analysis and insight both into the constructive power and the austerity of the much discussed reformer. Both the American and the Scotchman show an admirable spirit of cool detachment in the treatment of a life that has too often been handled with undue partisan heat by French and Germans.

Reyburn treats the early portion of Calvin's life and the conditions in Geneva much less adequately than Walker, giving less than a fifth of his book to the period up to Calvin's exile from Geneva, while Walker devotes nearly one-half his volume to this period. Reyburn is much fuller on the period after the execution of Servetus in 1553. To the subsequent epoch of triumph and to discussion of phases of Calvin's work and influence Reyburn gives one-half his book, Walker about one-fourth. Naturally it is in this latter half of the biography that the reader finds the most adequate and suggestive part of Reyburn's work, especially in half-a-dozen chapters upon "controversies," "the care of the churches," "the university," "personal characteristics," Calvin's "work," and "his theology."

There are some unfortunate errors, and somewhere perhaps the biographer could find something to say in defence of his statements and in criticism of the reviewer's conclusions. Through his error in stating that Calvin after his father's death turned his attention to theology again,[1] the biographer misses the significance of Calvin's keenest interest in the humanistic studies to which in fact he turned. The author appears less at home in Geneva than with Calvin. His statement[2] that in January, 1537, the "requests relative to discipline and excommunication were passed as pre-

[1] P. 15. [2] P. 66.

sented," is a pardonable interpretation of a somewhat vague vote, but it will not bear a more careful scrutiny of the various votes of the council, their actions and Calvin's, and the latter's letter to Bullinger. It took eighteen years of struggle to secure to the church the right of discipline in 1555.[3] The population of Geneva is set down several times as 15,000. The most careful estimator of Genevan numbers—E. Mallet—has shown the earlier and larger guesses untrustworthy, and his conclusion that the population did not exceed 13,000 receives deserved acceptance. The publication of the *Registres du Conseil de Genève* shows that the council of fifty was instituted in 1457, not in 1502 as Reyburn says. It is a mistake, as Kampschulte and Walker have pointed out, to use the name "Libertine" as a contemporary appellation for the Genevan party opposed to Calvin. "*Vénérable Compagnie*" is another term not used in Calvin's day, as Borgeaud has shown. The author gives no authority for his assertion that the council was made up of fathers of families. The franchises, council records, and testimony of the contemporary Bonnivard indicate that the membership was made up of *citoyens*, *bourgeois*, and *habitans*, who had been admitted by council and taken oath. In 1561 the council did not agree that "the members of the consistory should be selected from all who desired to follow the teaching of God, *whether they were citizens or not.*" Mr. Reyburn apparently follows the request of Calvin rather than the vote of the council, which was willing to go only so far as to agree that the selection should be without distinction between *citoyens* and *bourgeois*. The significance would be lost by his misinterpretation; Calvin was here, as on other occasions, ready to go further along the road tending toward democracy and separation of church and state than was the political authority of Geneva.

Such errors are venial rather than mortal sins and do not destroy the value of the essential picture of the reformer. One gets the impression that here is a biographer who has given time and interest to his task, has understood the reformer, and yet has had enough detachment and logic to pick flaws in the reasoning of Calvin. He has really interpreted him to modern minds. He has a happy faculty of illustrating his generalization by felicitous examples drawn from correspondence, sermons, and acts of councils. Calvin's "ceaseless vehemence" in enforcement of law and pursuit of offenders is illustrated by his measures to get rid of vice in the public baths and "the devil's acre," and by his efforts to make "the harlot, the drunkard, the blasphemer, and the loafer" "feel that a decent life gave

[3] Cf. note by the writer in this *Review*, I, 411.

them their only chance of peace and prosperity." His interpretation of how Calvin laid the foundations of modern democracy is clear and sound, as the author interprets democracy, though in a dozen pages one cannot expect much of illustrative detail. He points out how Calvin tended to develop reason and conscience, the power of the layman, the strong self-reliant man unabashed by artificial distinctions, strict morality, education, the conception of life as "a post of duty." A layman who would like a well written, non-technical exposition of a clear-headed theologian's views would find such a chapter as Mr. Reyburn's closing one a felicitous approach to a theology that fascinates because it is fearless and never shuffles. On the difficult subject of predestination the author shows suggestive and critical thinking of his own, and is keen and frank enough to point out an interesting "break-down" in Calvin's logic. His way out of Calvin's conclusions is through denial of his premise regarding the permanent alienation of any from the Father. His closing comparison between Calvin's teaching of predestination and the theory of the survival of the fit, leaves the reader with a feeling that the biographer has read and thought deeply as a Scotch biographer of Calvin would be expected to do. Reyburn's life may fairly be classed with Walker's as one of the best two brief biographies of Calvin so far written.

Herbert Darling Foster.

Dartmouth College.

Some Loose Stones. Being a Consideration of Certain Tendencies in Modern Theology Illustrated by Reference to a Book called *Foundations*. R. A. Knox, Fellow and Chaplain of Trinity College, Oxford. Longmans, Green, & Co. 1913. Pp. xxiv, 233. $1.35.

Restatement and Reunion. A Study in First Principles. B. H. Streeter, Dean of Queen's College, Oxford. Macmillan & Co. 1914. Pp. xxiv, 194. 2*s*. 6*d*.

In 1913 there was published in England: *Foundations. A Statement of Christian Belief in Terms of Modern Thought. By Seven Oxford Men.* It was an answer to an answer, a reply to *Lux Mundi;* which had endeavored to reply to the movement aroused by the long-preceding *Essays and Reviews.* But of course *Foundations* must itself be answered; and so there soon appeared the first of the volumes mentioned above—*Some Loose Stones.*

The author disclaims the competence to write a theological book (p. vii). The reader will be inclined to consider that he "doth protest too much"; for, whatever one may think of Mr. Knox's

opinions, he certainly shows much acquaintance with theology, at least of the static type. His position may be judged by his own description of himself: "If obscurantism is simply to believe that there are limits defined by authority within which theorizing is unnecessary and speculation forbidden, that there are some religious principles of such *a priori* certainty that any evidence which appears to conflict with them does not destroy them, as it would destroy a mere hypothesis, but by conflicting with them proves itself to have been erroneously or inadequately interpreted, then I welcome the title" (p. x). "The whole position stands or falls by the weakest parts in the defences; give up one article of the Nicene Creed, and the whole situation is lost." This is sturdy stalwartism, and Mr. Knox throughout is sturdily stalwart. In this spirit he treats Authority, the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Kenosis, the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection, Miracles; defending what he regards as the Catholic view as against the heresies of the writers of *Foundations*. There is always an interest in watching vigorous cudgel-play, and Mr. Knox's blows rain thick and heavy. His brilliant style indeed tends to a Chestertonian fondness for smart verbal effects—to paradox, antithesis, epigram; as on page 20: "the credibility of Judges or the edibility of Jonah." Controversy like this belongs to a bygone generation. It convinces those only who are already convinced. The arguments which carry conviction today must show more of the restraint of the scientific investigator and less of the overbearingness of the professional advocate.

The editor of *Foundations* and one of the contributors to it was Mr. B. H. Streeter, at that time chaplain to the bishop of St. Alban's. But the bishop's friends insisted to him so strongly that he ought to be scandalized at having such a dangerous person in his employ that, while he would not actually dismiss Mr. Streeter, he put it to him whether it was not his duty to resign. This hint Mr. Streeter accepted, and resigned.

The present book may be taken as an answer to *Some Loose Stones*, and a statement of Mr. Streeter's position with reference to the ecclesiastical situation in general and the Kikuyu controversy in particular. He takes his stand as follows: "I would urge that, provided always a clergyman is a sincere believer in the Divinity of our Lord and in the reality of his personal conquest over death, there is nothing anomalous or incongruous in his claim to treat certain clauses in the Creed as symbolical rather than as strictly literal expressions of these beliefs" (p. xvii). The author holds that "the principle of authority must necessarily occupy a far more impor-

tant place in religion than in any other department of thought or life. But in religion, as in every other department, authority can at most procure acquiescence. Conviction only results when a certain amount of understanding or personal verification is present also" (p. 40). In endeavoring to point out the ground of authority Mr. Streeter comes to the conclusion that "the authority of the church must await re-union, and re-union must await the clearer delimitation of truth." He holds that "the various branches into which the Western Church has been divided since the Reformation seem to have *specialized*, as it were, in different aspects of the Christian life. . . . A healthy unity is incompatible with uniformity. . . . Union, on the basis of a forcible suppression of differences, not only fails to achieve its object in practice, it is also wrong in idea. If it be true, for instance, that Anglicans, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Friends, have each of them something to learn from the other, none of them must throw away the characteristic truth they have to teach" (p. 162 f).

To many outside an established church such statements are not new. But to hear them from a highly placed ecclesiastic of the Church of England (Mr. Streeter is not only Dean of an Oxford College but has recently been appointed Canon of Hereford Cathedral) is a cheering sign that the tide of intelligence and courage in ecclesiasticism is rising. Yet though he has to a great degree passed beyond the limitation of his surroundings, he still shows traces of its narrowing influence in the cautiousness and sense of daring with which he takes steps which to others would seem beyond question (cf. p. 189). He does not yet walk unaware of danger. But to do so is perhaps asking too much from one who has felt so recently the fires of persecution.

Frederic Palmer.

Harvard University.

Saint Maximus the Confessor and the Byzantine Theology. (In Russian.) S. A. Epifanovic. Kieff. 1915. Pp. 138.

Saint Maximus the Confessor is deservedly praised both in the West and the East as one of the most acute theologians and profound mystics of the Greek Church. He was indeed the first systematic teacher of that type of Christian theology which the historians of ecclesiastical literature are wont to designate with the epithet of Byzantine. In his writings a powerful originality of view seems to vie with a rare greatness of conception. His genius focusses the

culture of Byzantium of the sixth and seventh centuries, and embodies the conflicting tendencies of an epoch of transition from the dead world of classical reminiscences to a thorough reconstruction of Christian theology on purely Christian foundations. Hence it follows that, to be rightly understood, the theological inheritance of Maximus, dogmatic and mystical, ought to be studied in the light of its social environment and of the tumultuous life of that metropolis where it was cradled.

We discover the dominating feature of Byzantium in the age of Maximus in its general aim at building up a new type of Christian theology, at emancipating its cultivated classes from the glamour of pagan beauty, at superseding the influence of the poets and philosophers of old on the development of Christian speculation and Christian inward experiences. In the literature of the age to which Maximus belongs, a deep religious feeling tones down and effaces the pagan element, which had been engrafted on Christian thought by the Alexandrian theological school. A great mystical fervor pervades all the classes of Byzantine society, and permeates every department of science and art. Church and State are no longer in sharp antagonism to each other; clergy and laity bind themselves together in the bond of a purely ecclesiastical ideal. The social influence of monasticism steadily increases; monks come out of monasteries and put forth preposterous claims to subject the civil society to the roughness of their ascetic ideal, and they play a foremost rôle in the shaping of the new soul of Byzantium. The Byzantine spirit, weaned from the learning of heathen masters, drenches itself in the purest Christian waters. To it, philosophy is as a means to the end of quarrying stones for the theological building of the Christian faith; poetry confines its task to enriching the treasure of the liturgical hymnology with new and invaluable pearls; the liberal arts have no other aim than that of filling up with rigid, gold-faced saints the mosaics of the churches. There is no manifestation of the Byzantine genius which does not bear the deeply impressed stamp of a religious ideal, or rather of an ascetic one. In its mystical outbursts Byzantium impels its vast crowds to the passionate pursuit of a cloistered life and of a cloistered literature.

These two characteristics of the Byzantine genius in the sixth century give a strong flavor of novelty to the writings of Maximus, and every lover of Byzantine literature will receive gratefully the book devoted to him by Sergius Epifanovic, a professor of the ecclesiastical Academy of Kieff. By the way, it must be noted that the strong personality of Maximus is well known in Russian ecclesiasti-

cal literature, which boasts some valuable contributions to the literary history of the Greek Fathers.

Suffice it to quote the following Russian works which throw light upon the mystical and dogmatic schemes of our great Byzantine theologian: A. Th. Vertelovsky, *Western Mysticism in the Middle-Ages and its Relations to Catholicism*, Kharkoff, 1888, pp. 55–66; Orloff, *The Writings of Saint Maximus the Confessor with regard to the Development of the Dogmatic Teaching of the Church about the Two Wills in the Person of Christ*, Petrograd, 1888; A. Brilliantoff, *The Influence of Eastern Theology on Western in the Writings of Johannes Scotus Erigena*, Petrograd, 1898; Bishop Alexis, *Saint Maximus the Confessor as a Representative of Christian Mysticism*, *Viera i Razum*, 1905, III, 124–139; Popoff, *The Idea of Deification in the Early Eastern Church*, Moscow, 1909; P. M. Minin, *The Chief Tendencies of the Old Ecclesiastical Mysticism*, *Bogoslovsky Vestnik*, 1911, III, 823–838; 1913, II, 151–172; 1914, II, 304–306, III, 42–68.[1]

Professor Epifanovic, indeed, has drawn some materials from the above quoted works of his countrymen as well as from foreign sources. But his thoroughly and completely elaborated volume supersedes all the earlier attempts at a systematizing of Maximus' mystical theories. The many references with which the pages of his volume are crammed show how perfectly he is acquainted with the literature of his subject, and with the doctrines of the Greek Fathers from the age of Clement of Alexandria up to the renaissance of Greek Mysticism in the fourteenth century.

When we come to analyze the book of Professor Epifanovic, the task is not an easy one. No chapters, no paragraphs, no indices in it to make its reading easier. The treatise resembles a lecture of considerable length. To trace back the sources from which Maximus drew the rules of the mystical life, Professor Epifanovic gives an account of the Mysticism of the Greek Church as it is exhibited in the writings of Macarius the Egyptian, Gregory of Nyssa, Evagrius, and Pseudo-Areopagita. After an historical sketch of Monophysite and Monothelite controversies he synthesizes the peculiar doctrines of Maximus, and portrays him as the leader of his contemporaries at Byzantium in the paths of the orthodox faith as well as of Christian perfection.

The best pages of his volume are occupied in bringing out in strong relief the quite opposite frames of mind of the Alexandrian and

[1] From an orthodox point of view is written also the modern-Greek work of S. Stavrides about the mystical teaching of Maximus: "Ἡ ὁδὸς πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, ἢ περὶ τοῦ τέλους τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, κατὰ Μάξιμον τὸν Ὁμολογητήν." Constantinople, 1894.

the Antiochian schools in the ancient Greek Church. In different ways these two schools clothed in a scientific dress the truths of the Christian revelation and for souls athirst for God prepared a celestial symposium. The Alexandrian Fathers manifest themselves as mystics of the deepest insight, while the Antiochians are thinkers of sober reasoning. Those undergo the preponderating sway of religious feeling; these aim at scientific research. Alexandrian scholarship, drawing nearer to God, sets forth the unattainable side of Christian teaching, dwells upon the spiritual and divine element of revealed truths, which they do not look upon with the short-sighted eyes of the human mind. Antiochians, on the contrary, attach not much weight to the mystical kernel of the Christian faith, and set themselves to the task of illuminating the mysteries by the pale gleams of the human intellect, and of formulating in precise terms the Christian dogmas. In regard to exegesis, Alexandrian Fathers and writers are fond of the allegorical method; in their apologetic essays they point to the mysterious influence of the Word upon mankind; as polemical writers they make the central point of their system the deification of believing souls; as historians they do not lay stress upon the supernatural factors leading the human race into the paths mapped out by Divine Providence. In their turn, Antiochians are followers of the literal interpretation of Holy Scripture; as polemists and historians they overestimate the cogency of rational arguments and the value of the empiristic method. To speak briefly, Alexandrian scholarship bathes itself in a deeply religious atmosphere saturated with mysticism, while that of Antioch moves freely over the field of a theology grounded upon the rational treatment of revealed truths.

Professor Epifanovic is not content to gather together the flowers of doctrine blossoming in the spiritual garden of Maximus. In the last pages of his work he goes back to the primal sources of Maximus' teaching; he discerns carefully what in it is impressed with the stamp of originality from what was carried in by the stream of the earlier Mysticism. Under his pen Maximus appears to us as a searcher holding fast to the traditional inheritance of Christian theology, handed down to him by an unbroken series of illustrious witnesses; and, on the other hand, as adding to the legacies of the past his own new experiences and new solutions to the problem faced by his genius. As Brilliantoff truly remarks, in the Eastern Church Maximus is hallowed with that crown of glory which in Western Christianity sparkles around the name of Augustine. As a dogmatic teacher, says Epifanovic, Maximus is the truest embodi-

ment of the Orthodox faith; in the polemical field, his productions displace the earlier Byzantine polemics against Monophysitism and Monotheletism. As a mystical ruler his influence became far-reaching in the Greek Church, and overstepped the limits of his age. By a happy fusion of the dry speculative system of Pseudo-Areopagita with the living ethical results of contemplative asceticism, he laid down sure foundations for the later mystical systems, and deserved to be designated by the name of founder of Byzantine Mysticism. Greek mystics of the eleventh century, like Simeon Junior and Nicethas Stethatos, and of the fourteenth century, like Gregory Sinaita, Callixtus Katafigiotis, Nicholas Kabasilas, Callixtus Xanthopoulos, wrote under his direct and immediate influence and clothed their conceptions in the literary garb adopted by him.

That is, in short, the portrait of Maximus traced by the Russian scholar. In the present output of mystical studies his work, no doubt, supplies a real want and renews the interest in mysterious and fascinating Byzantium. We do not presume to open the sealed book of the future, but we are firmly convinced that the vital powers of Byzantium are far from being exhausted. If through centuries of darkness it repeated the Horatian saying, "*Non omnis moriar*," it may also awake its slumbering energies, and begin a new era in the history of the world, and particularly of Eastern Christianity. We ought, therefore, to receive gratefully a work that unveils to us one side of the complex and multifarious soul of Byzantium, that launches us into the turmoil of its intensest religious and literary life, and gives us a meeting-place with the leaders of its genius and its spirit.

Aurelio Palmieri.

Harvard University Library.

Christianity in Early Britain. Hugh Williams, D.D. The Clarendon Press. 1912. Pp. viii, 484. 12*s*. 6*d*.

Hugh Williams died after his book was practically finished, but before it had been published. During his last illness David Phillips and John Owen Thomas consented to see it through the press. It is an expansion of the Birkenhead Lecture delivered in 1905.

Although the volume deals with the subjects that any scholar of the period would examine, it treats of many that appear only in books devoted to Welsh and Celtic specialties; such, for example, as the British Hagiographic Literature and the *Annales Cambriae* and

Annales Brittonum. And although it covers the well-known province of British, Celtic, and Roman Christianity, at every point it does so with a fresh and original touch. Not only does it tell the story of David and Illtud, but along with the narrative there is a critical analysis of the sources and a philological study of geographical and historical significance. And again even though the author comes to certain conservative conclusions, as, for example, in regard to St. Patrick, he does so only after mustering his evidence to the disadvantage of Zimmer and the advantage of Bury. Being more recently in the field and having a mastery of his material no less thorough than that of other scholars, his conclusions are entitled to careful examination.

The book enters regions of study which, although not new, are unusual. It asks and tries to answer the question, What would be the detailed service of a British church of A.D. 200? also, What was the actual or legendary relation between a prince, like Arthur, and the Church? It takes up some of the general assumptions, like the opposition of Druidism to Christianity and the intercourse between Britain and Armorica; showing in the one case that the hostility of Druidism was of little moment in Britain but of much in Ireland, and in the other case that Brittany was really another Britain with a vital Christian life, due to Britain's retreating before the invader and to the monastic missionary spirit.

Certain tentative conclusions to which the author comes are both interesting and indicative of independence. He thinks that Harnack is too hasty when he attributes the story of King Lucius and Pope Eleutherus to an error in transcription, whereby the British king is confused with a king at Edessa. According to Dr. Williams, Harnack allows too little for a very early Roman belief of Christianity in England. He would not have us accept the story; neither would he have us accept Harnack's ingenious explanation. He is inclined to account for all the divergences between Celtic and Roman use by the retention in the Celtic Church of institutions which at one time were common and possibly Roman. The reckoning of Easter which Augustine found in Britain was common to the continent not long before; Celtic Baptism was a combination of baptism and chrism, both administered by the presbyter—an early custom; ordination (consecration) was at the hands of one bishop instead of three—another early and common custom; the Celtic clergy, presbyters and bishops, were married, as they were in many places; the Celtic monks had the peculiar tonsure of close-cut hair across the front of the head from ear to ear, a fashion not

unknown on the continent and representing a widely exercised freedom in tonsure styles. At least these suggestions of Dr. Williams have the virtue of conclusions based upon comparative study and upon common sense.

By no means the least valuable part of the book, as already intimated, is its constant reference to the language current in the Church in Britain, to the pure Celtic words, to the loan-words, and to the Latin. To Dr. Williams language is a sensitive sign of the contemporary life, and therefore it may be of the first importance to the historian. However, the worth of the book in this respect is within the province of the philologist.

Henry B. Washburn.

Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge.

Date Due

GTU Library
3 2400 00291 4301

THREE DAY

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOL VIII 1915
APR 15 1918
APR 14
10 1961

DATE DUE
03 2011
FEB 02 2011
APR 01 2011
DEMCO, INC. 38-2931